MORMONISM:

OR,

THE DOCTRINES OF THE SELF-STYLED LATTER-DAY SAINTS

COMPARED

WITH ITSELF AND THE BIBLE,

AND

FOUND WANTING.

BY JOHN DAVIS.

Where truth *divine* its sacred light displays,
Foul falsehood *shrinks* beneath its fervid rays.
And where Truth's advocate her weapon plies
Imposture shudders—sickens—droops—and dies.

Sydney:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN L. SHERIFF, BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER,
135, GEORGE STREET.

1857.

1857

PRINTED AT THE EMPIRE GENERAL STEAM PRINTING OFFICE,
HUNTER STREET, SYDNEY.

INTRODUCTION.

I HAVE read in manuscript the following pages, which are now given to the public in print, and, at the request of the author, I venture thus publicly to express my opinion of the little work.

Mr. Davis has, I think, executed his task in a very satisfactory manner. He has grasped the subject with which he professes to deal; and, besides furnishing a vast amount of authentic information on the topics treated of, he has in a terse and concise style conclusively refuted the gross absurdities and glaring contradictions of Mormonism from the Word of God and their own writings, and exposed the immoral tendency both of their principles and practices.

It is a remarkable and a melancholy fact, fully attested in the history of past ages, and not less undeniably established by actual observation in the present day, that there is nothing too monstrous or too ridiculous in religious belief to be propounded to multitudes, and embraced, and held with a tenacity and firmness of purpose that might do honour to the clearest, the most important, and incontestible truths.

Nay, perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that, just in proportion as religious error outrages both Scripture, and reason, and common sense, in the same proportion is

its power to fascinate and enslave. There seems to be a magic influence about it that weakens and darkens, and casts a spell over the judgment, and clothes in a robe of beauty that deformity that is visible to every eye but that of the spell-bound devotee. There are many who can see no attractiveness in the sublime doctrines of the lively oracles of God, and have no relish at all for its "words of truth and soberness," whose imaginations are fired even with the maniacal ravings of weak-minded but wily impostors. An orthodox creed, when only theoretically held, is almost sure, in certain minds, to give way before the rush of that superstitious fervour which is awakened by alleged dreams and visions, and direct revelations, and immediate intercourse with Heaven. Recorded miracles are too tame for many minds. They would like to realise and see reproduced before them those stirring and wondrous scenes in which the mighty power of God was so singularly displayed in the olden time. Seas divided—rivers stayed in their course—the sun and the moon standing still—the lame healed—the blind restored to sight—and the dead in their winding sheets coming forth from their graves.

There is in many minds a morbid craving for novelty in religious belief, and this craving is stimulated and gratified by the bold and confident claims of impostors to inspiration and miraculous powers. And whenever the great landmarks of Bible truth have been disregarded and passed over under the influence of these morbid cravings, and the impulsive feelings which they generate, it is impossible to foresee in what a labyrinth of errors, both doctrinal and practical, those excited speculatists may involve themselves.

There is, moreover, in the state of mind now indicated, and the mental processes that lead to it, no small degree of pride and ambitious aspiration. The dupes of religious impostors, only too willing to be deceived, are elevated with the thought that the glory and honour are in some degree reflected upon themselves, which belong to these wonderful men who are entrusted with the secrets of heaven, and who are commissioned to exercise that authority and wield the mighty power of God upon earth. It matters not that there is not a particle of reliable evidence that these impudent claims and blasphemous pretensions are well founded, the judgment of the dupes has been already surrendered, and while they are taught to regard it as something like impiety to question or scrutinize such claims, the share which they fancy they have in the honour of those by whom these claims are made overbears and lulls into slumber any awakening effort of judgment and common sense, and deepens and perpetuates the delusion.

To be a member of a religious society, of whose doctrines and practice the revealed word of God is the only standard —to have religious instructors, who neither possess nor claim to possess any superhuman powers, whose appeals are only to the law and the testimony, illustrated by superior knowledge and more familiar acquaintance with the written Word, and personal experience of its truth and power—this is too humble and commonplace for many minds—there is nothing exciting or distinguished about it. But there is something grand and most solacing to self-importance in being associated with a society whose instructors have, according to their impious pretension, seen

God, like Moses, face to face, and talked familiarly with Him—who stand now on the same level with the Prophets and the Apostles of old, invested with the same miraculous powers—unfolding as fully, and with the same divine authority, the purposes and the counsels of Jehovah. The pride that ruined man at first—the pride that prompted him to be equal to his Maker, and to believe the devil rather than God, has in all ages laid his fallen posterity open to the snare of the Devil and to the seductive influence of lying wonders—to the "cunning craftiness" of the emissaries of Satan, and to the power of all the "desecrableness of unrighteousness."

Mormonism—so named from the "Book of Mormon," a pretended new revelation, found in the earth on a hill-side in Kentucky, in the United States of America, by a man named Smith, of very questionable reputation, who alleged that in a vision he had been charged to seek it, and directed where to find it—the new revelation being inscribed on plates or tablets of gold. Mormonism is the most extravagant and barefaced imposture that, in these modern times, has been been submitted to, and attempted to be imposed on the world. Its origin and all its adjuncts form such a clumsy invention that, even taking into account those principles and tendencies of fallen human nature above alluded to, it is still amazing that such an amount of folly and credulity should exist as even to give it the narrowest standing ground upon the earth. But I am not called upon here to discuss the tenets, or the principles, or the practices of the sect.

This, in my judgment, Mr. Davis has done to some purpose in the following pages. The artillery of the Sacred

Scriptures is brought to bear with effect on this modern "Tower of Babel," while the inconsistencies and the incongruities contained in the writings of their so-called Apostles and High Priests, are brought out into bold relief, and there is no escape left from the withering exposure.

I am inclined to believe that the paroxysms of this Mormon Mania have greatly subsided in Sydney, and no single man has done more, and I believe not so much, to produce this result as the Author of these pages.

Many will remember that, when some few years ago, this impudent imposture forced on the public notice in this city, its impious pretensions in placards, and pamphlets, and open air meetings, Mr. Davis encountered them in all directions and at every turn, and his exertions did, by the blessing of God, very effectually check the spread of the delusion.

Some may say, we see nothing of Mormonism, and hear nothing of Mormonism, and why should this book be published now?

The Mormons have grown wiser in their generation. They work more secretly in the diffusion of their tenets, and perhaps not less, but more effectually, if the statement be true which I have just heard, that a few weeks ago, a ship left our harbour with about 200 souls on board, disciples of the Mormon faith, destined for the "Salt Lake;" one of these hopeful inhabitants of the New Jerusalem taking with him *three wives*, and several others *two*. Though the snake may be scotched, it is not killed, and every able and well meant effort to deliver our fellow men from the snare of an erroneous belief, or to prevent them falling into it, deserves encouragement. An unpre-

tending title work like this will find its way into quarters where more elaborate and voluminous productions would not come. A mere bough from a tree sweetened the bitter waters of Marah—a stone from a sling thrown by a stripling, laid low the champion of the uncircumcised Philistines who had defied the armies of the living God.

I regard this little treatise as extremely creditable to Mr. Davis, as a working man—a self-taught man, and, according to the ordinary acceptation of the term, an uneducated man. I am confident that this circumstance, far from detracting from the merit of the little book, will enhance its merit in the estimation of those who may really be termed educated. They are best able to judge of and appreciate the power of thinking, and the capability of writing which it displays; and I am no less confident, that it will commend itself to the judgment and sound sense of our intelligent artizans. It is a credit to their order—it reflects honour on the class to which they belong.

It is a valuable contribution to the elucidation and maintenance of divine truth as revealed in the Scriptures, in its bearing on one of the endless forms of error that have sprung up in our own day—a form of error which, in spite of its glaring absurdities and immoral tendencies, has been able to acquire an amount of support and a number of adherents all but incredible.

ALEX. SALMON.

FORT-STREET, SYDNEY,
15*th July*, 1857.

PREFACE.

Dear Reader,

The following pages are the result of a patient and lengthened investigation of the claims of Mormonism. How far I have succeeded in demonstrating, from their own authorised publications, its self contradictory character, you must be the judge. I wish it to be distinctly impressed upon your mind, that what I have written has been written in the spirit of love to those who are deluded by this *most infamous* attempt to cajole the unthinking and unwary. Had I designed to write a laboured essay, I might have extended this volume to four times its size. My object was to lay before the public a "bird's eye view" of the system, with heads of arguments thereon, that those who come in contact with its advocates may be able to think it out for themselves. If the Mormon Elders can shew that I have in any way misquoted their writings they are at liberty to expose the same in the columns of the *Australian Banner*, which will be open to them for that purpose.

It will be seen, that in the extracts I have made, many subjects arise which I could not enter upon without greatly increasing the size of this work.

The cause of the newspaper correspondence is briefly this. After reading several works which I had purchased from C. W. Wandell, the then leader of the sect in Sydney,

I asked him if he "was open to discuss the principles he promulgated both by his preaching and the publications he circulated?" He replied, "Yes, at a proper time and place." This was on the Hyde Park, on January 23, 1853. During the following week, I sent him a statement of the principal propositions I required him to discuss. A week or so afterwards, I had a conversation with Mr. John Jones, which led to the advertisement which stands at the head of the correspondence.

As I desire to avoid any approach to egotism, I would gladly have suppressed that portion which may be considered personal, but the connection would not allow it.

I now send it forth to be tossed upon the uncertain waves of public opinion. If but one soul is plucked from that hideous system of *concentrated* Anti-Christianism, into the enjoyment of a *blessed resurrection*, I shall feel an ample reward for any trouble I may have taken.

Reader!—"Prepare to meet thy God." "God was *in* Christ *reconciling* the world unto himself; we therefore, pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God."—2 Cor. v. chap.

I remain,

Yours in the bonds of Christ,

J. D.

July, 1857.

MORMONISM, ETC.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

To The Editor of the Empire.

SIR—The Editors of the *Herald* having refused to insert the following, would you be kind enough to give it a place in your valuable paper, and oblige yours, &c.,

JOHN JONES.

To the Editors of the Herald.

GENTLEMEN—As Mr. John Davis, of Canterbury, from his advertisement in the *Herald* of yesterday, appears to like to see his name in the papers, please to insert the following, and oblige yours, &c.,

JOHN JONES.

Sydney, 27th January, 1853.

MR. W. C. WANDELL.

SIR—As you have agreed to discuss the principles you hold and promulgate in the printed publications of your Society, I send you the following propositions, which will form the ground of our discussion, and from which I do not intend to depart :—

1. You will demonstrate, that our Bible of the Old and New Testament is "so generally corrupt" as to be an "unfit" guide in faith and morals.—I will undertake to prove the opposite.

2. You will undertake to reconcile the glaring contradictions which are in the standard writings of the Society to which you belong.—I will undertake to shew them to be irreconcilable.

In discussing the first proposition it will (in order for the public to have some standard of judgment in the matter) be necessary for you to produce the newly-revealed Bible which you profess to have received from Joseph Smith.

The friends who hand you this will receive your reply.

I am, Sir, yours &c.,

JOHN DAVIS.

The following is the reply to the foregoing, which his "friends" were to call and receive on the Monday following the above date, but did not until a week afterwards, at which time it had been removed :—

MR. JOHN DAVIS.

SIR—Your letter of January 27th, to "MR. W. C. WANDELL," has been, by Elder C. W. Wandell, President of the Australasian Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, presented to the congregation of said Church in this city, who appointed the undersigned a Committee to consider it and write you an answer.

We therefore write in reply, that we approve of the answer made you by Elder Wandell, on the Hyde Park, on Sunday, the 23rd instant, in reply to your question at that time, namely—"If our principles are open to discussion?" His reply was, "They are at a proper time and place."

We are, therefore, ready to treat with your friends as to "time" and "place;" and we have appointed Elder John Jones to be your opponent.

The sentence which you have miscalled (1) a proposition, we disallow; and have never maintained that "The Bible is so generally corrupt as to be an 'unfit' guide in faith and morals." But, if you referred to the Apostle Orson Pratt's proposition, as contained in his "Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon," page 33, which reads thus:—"The Bible and tradition, without further revelation, an insufficient guide;" we say, that we agree with him most heartily, and Elder Jones will defend the proposition against all your attacks.

Elder Jones will also defend the standard writings of our Church, namely—The Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, Voice of Warning, and other writings of the Twelve Apostles (2) of said Church, against your charge of "glaring contradictions;" provided that you furnish him with a list of the said supposed contradictions, with a reference to each where it can be found, at least one day previous to the discussion.

With regard to his producing the inspired translation of the Bible at the discussion, he will agree to do so, either in part or in whole, provided that you produce the ORIGINAL tablets and manuscripts with which it can be compared.

There is one condition which it will be proper to mention here, namely—that, as Elder Jones will represent the Church of the Saints, it will be required of you to represent some acknowledged body of religious people also.

All other conditions to be settled at the earliest convenience of your friends.

We are, Sir, yours, &c.,

JOHN BATIN,
JOHN JONES,
WM. ROBB,
} Committee.

And now, Messrs. Editors, since Mr. John Davis has withdrawn himself from the proposed debate, he will, no doubt, lecture when, where, and against whatever he pleases.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

JOHN JONES.

February 12.

The following appeared in *The Empire* of February 17, 1853:—

MORMONISM, OR INFIDELITY UNMASKED.

In Saturday's issue of *The Empire* there is an advertisement, signed "John Jones," purporting to be an answer to an advertisement of mine which appeared in Friday's issue of the *Herald*, headed "Mormonism, or Infidelity unmasked," as also a communication of mine to C. W. Wandell, containing two propositions as the ground of the proposed discussion between him and me.

Had the reply been truthful, I would not have thus publicly noticed it, as I am determined not to engage in newspaper squibbing.

In the third paragraph they deny holding the doctrine I charge them with. They write, "The sentence which you have miscalled a proposition we disallow, and have

never maintained that the Bible is so generally corrupt as to be an unfit guide in faith and morals." They thus publicly assert that they "have never maintained" the general corruption and unfitness of the Bible as a guide. Is this truth, or is it evasion? We shall see. Apostle Orson Pratt (as he is called), whose work John Jones undertakes to defend, in the 46th page of his collected pamphlets, when referring to the Old Testament, writes thus:—"What confidence, then, can Catholics or Protestants have in these half-destroyed, corrupted, mutilated Hebrew manuscripts. All, therefore, is uncertainty as to the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament, they can be proved to be changed, added unto, and corrupted in almost every text."

What shall we say of those who thus publicly proclaim that they do not believe in the "generally corrupt" state of our Bible, whilst in their authorised publications they maintain that it is "corrupt in almost every text." Can they be lovers of truth? I doubt it.

Again, on the same page, O. Pratt, concerning the New Testament, writes—"It is abundantly proved by various learned writers, that the Greek copies of the New Testament are awfully corrupted in almost every text." Again, page 47, "what shall we say concerning the Bible's being a sufficient guide." Again, page 48, writing on the divided state of Christendom, he says—"Satan has taken advantage of tkeir dark and benighted condition and robbed the world of a great number of the sacred books, corrupting those few that remained to such a degree, that he has got the whole of Christendom quarrelling about their true meaning."

Here, then, we have one who claims inspiration and a special call to the apostolic office (Doc. and Cov., page 208), maintaining the awful corruption and unfitness as a guide, of either the Catholic or Protestant Bible. And on the other hand, we have priests Batin, Jones, and Robb, disavowing! Have the Sydney Branch turned rebels against the Apostles? Or, did they tell the truth, when they said "they disallowed and never maintained" the statement contained in my proposition? I leave the public to judge.

In the last paragraph, John Jones charges me with having withdrawn myself from the debate. This he knew was a false statement. In the presence of many witnesses, I challenged Wandell personally to discuss the principles he promulgated. Jones appears in the reply, and not Wandell; therefore, Wandell has withdrawn. But it matters not to me whether Wandell or Jones was my opponent—either would suit me; if they were willing, and had not as a body withdrawn, by placing in my way what they have published to the world—they believe impossible for the whole world to do—namely, to "produce the ORIGINAL tablets and manuscripts" of the Bible, that they may be compared with their newly revealed Bible—not the Book of Mormon.

Concerning those manuscripts, Orson Pratt writes (page 45)—"The whole Catholic and Protestant world cannot produce the original writings of one single book of either the Old or New Testaments. The originals are nowhere to be found among Christians, Pagans, Jews, or Mahomedans."

If Wandell, or Jones, or any of them, had desired the

debate to proceed, they would not have asked me (as a condition of proceeding with the debate) to do what they acknowledge is impossible for the whole world to perform. This shews the infidels' craftiness.

Suppose, however, that I could produce those "tablets and manuscripts," what advantage would be gained by comparing them with their newly revealed Bible? None. In fact, if the autographs of the prophets and apostles could be produced, the Mormons would not have the opportunity of claiming a new revelation on the subject. If they have, as they say, our Bible newly revealed, they should place it alongside "the awfully corrupt" one, that its truthfulness might more prominently appear.

Again, they require that I shall represent a particular sect; this would do well enough if our debate was to be on sectarian peculiarities. Such not being the nature of my proposition, no particular sect was individually and separately interested. It affects all sects of professing Christians, whether Catholic or Protestant; this the Mormons knew. Their endeavour, therefore, to shift the subject to sectarianism shews their desire to shirk the debate. But men who believe that "the Devil was turned out of heaven because he wished to save all mankind from the consequences of sin,"* may publish anything they please.

Weather and health permitting, I intend to be on the Racecourse for several Sundays.

JOHN DAVIS,

Canterbury.

---

* "Millenial Star," N. 18, A.D. 1852. See Note 3.

TO THE PUBLIC.

1. Mr. John Davis, of Canterbury, in a letter published in your issue of the 17th instant, has endeavoured to make the public believe that the Latter-day Saints have shrunk from a public discussion of their principles, but a slight examination of the correspondence already published in relation to this matter, will satisfy any candid mind that it is Davis that has shrunk from the debate.

2. In his letter dated January 27th, he required the compliance with a condition, the which, according to his admission on Sunday, the 13th instant, he knew to be impossible. The condition referred to is the following—"It will be necessary for you to produce the newly revealed Bible which you profess to have received from Joseph Smith."

3. On Sunday, the 13th instant, he stated that Mr. Robb, in a conversation, told him that we had not the new translation—that it was not printed—that the time had not come for publishing it.

4. Now, when he asked for the production of the inspired translation at the debate, did he not require that which he must have necessarily believed to be impossible. The motive for so doing must be apparent.

5. The condition requiring the production of the tablets, &c., was relative, and depended upon the one named in his letter cited above.

6. If Davis had only withdrawn the condition with which he knew the Saints could not comply, the necessity for the other would have ceased to exist.

7. When Mr. D., in company with his friend, applied for an answer to his communication, he was plainly told

by myself that we did not hold the Bible to be an unfit guide, but that it was an insufficient guide. He was challenged to produce the word unfit in O. Pratt's works.

8. This he has failed to do. It is not to be found in any of the sentences cited by him.

9. It is true that he has found the word insufficient; this we allow, and are prepared to meet him upon it.

10. If he does not understand the difference between an object being unfit and insufficient, let him apply to his prompter (4). Perhaps he will inform him.

11. Apostle O. Pratt, in his series of pamphlets on the Divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon, takes the following positions:—1st, more revelation, not unscriptural; 2nd, more revelation, not unreasonable; 3rd, more revelation necessary.

12. One of the arguments adduced by him in favour of the last named position, is the admitted corruption of the Bible, in proof of which he cites the following authors: Brett, Bonfrerius, Torniellus, St. Chrysostom, Justin, Jerome, Bellarmine, Cressy, and Usher.

13. (The public will be able to appreciate Davis's conduct, in keeping this fact back.) (5.)

14. From these admissions, O. Pratt argues the insufficiency of the Bible, and the necessity for revelation, and, on the 48th page, he expresses himself in the following manner:—"The true cause of all the division which distracts modern Christendom, is the want of inspired apostles and prophets: they, through wickedness and apostacy, lost the keys of revelation some seventeen centuries ago, since which time they have been altogether unable to open the door of knowledge. Satan has taken advantage of

their dark and benighted condition, and robbed the world of a great number of sacred books, corrupting those few that remain to such a degree, that he has got the whole of Christendom quarreling about their true meaning."

15. The above quotation will show to the public that the grand question of difference between Latter-day Saints and the so-called Christian public, is Revelation (6). The Latter-day Saints contend that the foundation of the Church of God is Revelation—its true organisation, living Apostles and Prophets, &c. Why did not Mr. Davis meet his propositions boldly, as an enquirer after truth? Was he afraid? If so, he shall be accommodated in his own way; he shall be dealt with as a spoiled child, who will cry and whimper, and not only disturb its own peace, but the peace of all around it, unless it gets its own way.

16. Mr. Davis shall be met on the proposition that he has presented to the public.

17. He, by his advertisements, letter, and discourses, has stigmatised Mormonism as infidelity. I now, therefore, challenge him to public discussion of the following proposition (7):—

IS MORMONISM INFIDELITY?

18. Should he agree to meet me on this proposition, he or his friends may learn the name and address of those whom I have appointed to make the necessary arrangement, by application to Mr. Robb, of George-street. And if he does not meet me, I shall esteem him as unworthy of the waste of any more time, pen, ink, paper, or money.

JOHN JONES.

Saturday, Feb. 26.

MORMONISM, OR INFIDELITY UNMASKED.

To the Public.

1. Mr. John Jones, of Chippendale, has published a letter in the issue of this paper (*The Empire*) on the 26th of last month, wherein he charges me with endeavouring to give a false view of the correspondence between me and Mr. C. W. Wandell.

2. The statements I made in my letter, as published in this paper on the 17th of last month, I refer the public to, and still maintain their correctness (8).

3. In the second paragraph, he, in part, states my condition respecting their newly revealed Bible, and says, "according to his (my) admission on Sunday, 13th instant, I knew it to be impossible;" and then, in his third paragraph, ascribes to me a statement which I never made, nor did I say anything approaching thereto. When Mr. Jones sent that paragraph to the Press he knew it did not state the truth, but infidelity has, at all times, endeavoured to throw a blind over the public mind (9).

4. A week or two previous to my decision to oppose Mormon Infidelity, or the doctrine of the Latter-day Saints, as they call themselves, in conversation with Mr. Robb, I asked him why they did not publish their newly revealed Bible to the world? The only answer he made me was, "The world would not receive it." This is what I stated on Sunday, the 13th. Until Mr. Jones published his letter, I did not hear, nor did I ever say I heard, that they (the Mormonites) had not a "newly revealed Bible.

5. A book may be printed for the use of a society, and yet not be published to the world. As, for example, the Private Prayer of the Beardies, or people "surnamed

Israelites." When a fresh supply is forwarded to them they, in order to keep them from the world, are commanded to "burn" the old ones.

6. I was somewhat surprised when I read, in Mr. Jones's letter, the denial of the possession of this book, knowing as I do, that they boast of having our Bible re-revealed to them through Joseph Smith, and in their publications give extracts from it. See Doctrine and Covenants, page 9, par. 5; page 11, par. 21. (10.)

7. Joe Smith professes to have received a Revelation, commanding him, when he received the Scriptures in full, he was to "teach them to all men." This was in February, 1831. In the month of March of the same year, he professes to have received power to translate the New Testament, an extract from which appears in the "Pear of Great Price," under the title of "an extract from a translation of the Bible, being the xxiv. chap. of Matthew, commencing with the last verse of the xxiii. chap." Doc. and Cov., p. 127, par. 15; and p. 137, par. 11. Pearl, p. 30.

8. Here, then, we have on the one hand, "Joe Smith, the Mormon Prophet, Seer, and Revelator," as they call him, laying claim to the authorship of this "Newly Revealed Bible." And in their Standard Books we have reference made thereto, and extracts from this "inspired translation," as they term it; on the other hand, we have Mr. Jones disclaiming its possession by them. Who are we to believe, Mr. John Jones, or Mr. Joe Smith, their so-called prophet? (11.)

9. These pretended Revelations are 22 years old—Joe Smith is about 8 years dead. And yet, although he was

commanded to "teach them to all men," Mr. Jones says "they have not got such a book as the Newly Translated Bible, and therefore it was impossible for them to produce it." Well, I suppose we must believe Mr. Jones, and then it follows, as a matter of course, that Joe Smith was an arrant impostor and a liar.

10. Paragraphs 4 and 5 depend upon the previous one.

11. His 6th paragraph is intended to lead the public to suppose that I had been requested to withdraw my condition. Such a proposal was never made either publicly or privately, nor is it even hinted at in their published reply to my communication. (*Empire*, February 12.)

12. When in company with my friend, I saw Mr. Jones. He told me "there was one condition with which I should comply before they would hold a discussion with me—namely, that I should appear as the accredited representative of some religious sect." (*Empire*, February 12.) To this condition I demurred, and told him, I never did, nor would I now, in my controversial movements, appear as a sectarian. His reply was (nearly verbatim), "Well, then, there can be no discussion with you, as otherwise we might be annoyed by every sweep who chose to give a challenge." Not even a whisper was uttered about the impossibility of their complying with my condition. Their cry, then, of "impossibility," in the present state of the case, can be viewed by the public in no other light than as a desire to avoid the discussion of my proposition, namely—"Is our Bible so generally corrupt as to be an unfit guide in faith and morals."

13. The public will now see that the desire to with-

draw a condition was made by me, and not by Mr. Jones, or any one on his behalf.

14. Those who have candidly read my letter, as published in the *Empire* of the 17th of last month, are, I have no doubt, satisfied that I have proved the proposition I stated for discussion is contained in their publications. As a further confirmation of my charge against them, I quote the following from O. Pratt's Works, p. 46, par. 46:—"Mr. Cressy writes in these words—'In my hearing, Bishop Usher professed, that whereas he had of many years a desire to publish the New Testament in Greek, with various lections and annotations, and for that purpose had used great diligence, and spent much money to furnish himself with manuscripts; yet in conclusion, he was forced to desist utterly, lest if he should ingeniously have noted all the several differences of reading, which himself had collected, the incredible multitude of them in almost every verse, should rather have made men atheistical, than satisfy them in the true reading of any particular passage.' Let those who take the Bible for their only guide think of this. If the few manuscripts procured by Bishop Usher, contains in almost every verse an incredible multitude of different readings, what grounds have Protestants for confidence in one of these readings more than in another? Out of a thousand different manuscripts, differing in almost every text, who can select the true one? Indeed, there would be almost an infinite improbability as to any one copy being true. Now it was from such a mass of contradictory Greek manuscripts that the English New Testament was translated." Again, "What shall we say, then, concerning the Bible's being a sufficient guide? Can we

rely upon it in its present known corrupted state as being a faithful record of God's Word. . . . . *Who knows that even one verse of the whole Bible has escaped pollution*, so as to convey the same sense now that it did in the original? The Catholics and Protestants do not know, because tradition is too imperfect to give this knowledge." So writes Orson Pratt.

15. From the above, it will be seen that when the Mormonite pretends to argue out of our Scriptures, he does not mean to bow to the divine authority of the sacred writers. If he can by specious reasoning make them speak his own opinions, he will avail himself of their authority over the multitude, that he may have greater success in undermining their faith. Whenever the Bible is shown to contradict their doctrines, they hide themselves under the charge of its "awfully corrupt state."

16. But is our Bible so "awfully corrupted" that no "confidence" can be placed in it? NO, God be thanked, NO. Can we not rely upon it as a "*faithful* record of God's Word?" YES, God be thanked, YES. Nothing that I can say will so clearly prove this as the following quotations from the writings of men who spent the greater part of their lives in studying this subject:—"Great pains have been taken by learned men, and especially by the diligent and judicious Dr. Kennicott, to collate the remaining manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, and the result has been *satisfactory* in the highest degree. Many various readings of a *trivial* kind have been discovered, but scarcely any of real consequence. These differences are indeed of *so little* moment, that it is sometimes absurdly objected to the laborious work of Dr. Kennicott, which contains the

collation of nearly 700 (seven hundred) Hebrew manuscripts, that it *does not* enable us to correct a single important passage in the Old Testament; whereas, that very circumstance implies that we have in fact derived from that excellent undertaking the greatest advantage which could have been wished for by any real friend to revealed religion; namely, the *certain knowledge* of the agreement of the copies of the ancient Scriptures, now extant in their original language, with each other and with our Bible. This point thus clearly established is still further confirmed by the general coincidence of the present Hebrew copies with ALL the early translations of the Bible, and particularly with the Septuagint Version, the earliest of them all, and which was made 270 years before Christ." (Tomline's study of the Bible, part 1, chap. 1.) The reader will be able to see the points of comparison between this and Orson Pratt's statement.

17. In his 12th paragraph, Mr. Jones says, that "in proof of the admitted corruption of the Bible, O. Pratt cites the following authors," and then gives a list of names.

18. I now distinctly state, that this assertion of Mr. Jones's contains a known falsehood. O. Pratt does not refer to all those authors as having admitted the "awful corruption" of our Bible.

19. Brett is cited by Pratt as an authority for the opinion that the originals of Moses and the earlier prophets were destroyed by the Assyrians about 600 years before Christ, and that the copies used by Ezra were destroyed by Antiochus Epiphanes (page 45, 46). This has nothing to do with the corruption of the Text, as there then were numerous correct copies in existence. Deut. xvii. chap. 18 v., and vi. chap. 7 v.; Dan. ix. chap. 2 v. (12.)

20. With reference to the venerable Usher, it will be seen by my 14th paragraph that it is merely a hearsay statement O. Pratt quotes. He does not quote Usher, as Jones would lead the public to suppose.

21. Bonfrerius and Torniellus, are cited as noticing some additions which appear to have been made to some of the Books, Gen. xxxvi., xxxi.; Deut. xxxiv. Not a word is said about the corrupt state of the Text. O. Pratt might, with equal propriety, have also quoted Tom Paine, who like himself refers to the same and other similar passages, as objections against the authenticity and genuineness of the Bible. INFIDELS, and none but infidels, have always referred to these passages as standing objections. But why do they not carry out their principle, and object to the authenticity of every book to which some future editor has affixed an account of the author's death?

22. Had I so falsely quoted their own writings, as Mr Jones has done, he might well accuse me of misrepresenting their doctrines. But infidels make a fair show, that they may the more easily deceive, "and no marvel, for Satan transformeth himself into an angel of light."

23. Mr. Jones's pretended treatment of me as a "spoiled child," so clearly shows the vexed spirit of the man, that I pass it by with contempt.

24. When Orson Pratt, the Mormon Apostle, and Messrs. Jones and Wandell, placed themselves side by side with the notorious Tom Paine, in their objections to the genuineness of our Bible, they well knew that such statements were demonstrated falsehoods. But what can we expect from men who endeavour to *reduce* the power of the Great Jehovah, *to that* of a clever man. Orson

Pratt writes, "when man *makes* light, he does so by operating upon the substances of nature so as to render the latent light visible, and in *no instance does he create the light from nothing.* Therefore, reasoning from analogy, we have good grounds for believing *that God makes light* the same *as man* does." (Great First Cause, p. 4.) In this quotation, and in the whole of the tract from which it is taken, MAN and GOD, as regards their creative powers, are placed upon a level. The atheistical tendency of such doctrine is too plain to need comment.

25. Mr. Jones's quibble about the words "insufficient" and "unfit" is, when we consider the subject in hand, so *supremely* contemptible as scarcely to deserve a reply. If we are commanded to appeal to the "law and testimony" for knowledge, as to what the prophet or priest may teach us (Isaiah viii. 20), and it at the same time be "awfully corrupt, in almost every text," is it not, I ask, not only an *insufficient*, but also a *totally unfit* director? Again, if we obey our Lord's command, and "search the Scriptures" (John v. 39), and they at the same time be "awfully corrupt," will they not give uncertain direction, as to the line of duty we are to pursue? Is it not, therefore, not merely *insufficient*, but *totally unfit* for the object it proposes to accomplish? If what O. Pratt says were true, the Bible, of all books, would be the most unfit to read.

26. To split hairs about the words "unfit" and "insufficient," when the salvation of the soul is at stake, is just about as rational as it would be to tell the mariner, who by trusting to an incorrect chart, was wrecked, that *it was not an unfit chart* that led him astray and caused the wreck of his vessel, but only an "*insufficient*" one.

Would he not at once contemptuously exclaim, "Sir, is it because you think me a madman that you draw such distinctions where there is no difference?"

27. The proposition I have placed before the public is the integrity of the text of our Bible, and its fitness as a guide in faith and morals. This the Mormonites wish to avoid. The man who is *either afraid or ashamed* to have his foundations examined, must be conscious of a *rotten* cause.

28. That our Bible has been preserved almost miraculously pure, has been shown in the quotation from Bishop Tomline, and will, if possible, more fully appear from the following statement from the pen of that celebrated biblical critic, Dr. Adam Clarke:—"Notwithstanding all the helps which the varions manuscripts and ancient versions afford for the illustration of the Sacred Text, the reader must not imagine that in those manuscripts and versions which do contain the whole of the sacred text, there is any essential defect in matters relating to *faith and practice*, and consequently to the salvation of the Christian—THERE IS NO SUCH MANUSCRIPT, there is NO such version. So has the Divine Providence ordered it, that *although* a number of mistakes have been committed by careless copyists, as well as by careless printers, *not one* essential truth of God has been *injured* or *suppressed*. In this respect *all is perfect*, and the way of the Most High is made so plain, that even in the poorest copies, the wayfaring man, though a fool, destitute of deep learning and critical abilities, need not err therein. All the OMISSIONS of the ancient manuscripts put together would not countenance the *omission of one essential* doctrine of the

Gospel relative to faith or morals, and all the ADDITIONS countenanced by the whole mass of manuscripts already collected *do not* introduce a single point essential to either faith or manners." (13.)

I have many more things to write, and quotations to make from O. Pratt and others; but, as I have already written a long letter, and printing is expensive, I must for the present bid the public adieu.

I will, if possible, be on the race-course next Sabbath. My subject will be—"Is Man independent of God: or did Man in his pre-existent state make this World?"

JOHN DAVIS,
Canterbury.

19th March, 1853.

*** The figures in the body of the foregoing Correspondence between parenthesis refer to the Notes.

NOTES.

I.

Those who take the trouble to compare my question with that quoted by Mr. Jones from Orson Pratt, will see that mine has an equal right to be called a proposition. So much for Jones's judgment in the matter.

II.

In this reply to my note, the reader is requested to observe the following particulars. They, the Mormons, admit as standard Works :—The Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, Voice of Warning, and other writings of the Twelve Apostles of their Church. Brevity prevented me extending these quotations to a much greater length. The careful reader will not fail to see the object O. Pratt had in view when he made such assertions ;—namely, to undermine the Divine authority of our Bible, and thus make room for the blasphemies he subsequently puts forth.

Take a specimen—"The creation of something from nothing is not a truth founded on divine revelation. We learn from the revealed Truths, which God has been pleased to give to man, that the sun, moon, stars, heavens, earth, and all things, were created by Him ; but we nowhere learn in those sacred oracles that any one of these things were created from nothing. The original words

rendered in our language, *create* and *make*, are *synonymous terms*, signifying, as we have every reason to believe, the formation of things out of the original elements; at least, we are nowhere informed in revelation, that these words had any other meaning. It has been said, that as God created all things, and as elements are things, therefore he must have created them also. But if all the elements be included among the things created, then the DEITY *must have created the elements*, or *parts* of which He himself consists, which would be the very height of absurdity, for it would suppose Him to exist and not to exist at the same time; hence the phrase 'all things' cannot mean the elements, but only the 'all things' that are created of the elements. Therefore, the *creation of something from nothing is not* a truth founded on divine revelation." Great First Cause, p. 3.

Now, what can be more blasphemous than the substance of the above quotation. God is composed of the same materials as the elements—but the elements are eternal, therefore, the elements are God; that is to say, earth, air, fire, water, &c., are God. What absurdity!

According to the above theory, there is in reality "no God," or in other words, Atheism is the true religion.

The above statement has a special object in view—namely, to make way for the quotation I have inserted in the 24th par. of my last letter. Many other quotations of a similar character might be made. But as I do not wish to, unnecessarily, enlarge this pamphlet, one upon the Holy Spirit shall suffice.

"The Holy Spirit being one part of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and proper-

ties, in many respects, as the spirits of the Father and Son. It exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connexion with all material worlds. This is called God in the Scriptures, as well as the Father and Son. God the Father and God the Son *cannot* be everywhere present; indeed, they cannot be even in two places at the same instant: but God the Holy Spirit is omnipresent—it extends through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one *atom* of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. . . . . Each *atom* of the Holy Spirit is intelligent, and, like all other matter, *has* solidity, form, and size, and occupies space. . . . . Its distinguishing characteristics from other matter are its almighty powers and infinite wisdom, and many other glorious attributes which other materials do not possess. If several of the atoms of this Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then this person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity, that is, it *could not* be everywhere present." Kingdom of God, Part I., p. 4, 5.

The astonished reader may perhaps enquire what is all this about? what is its object? what is its tendency?

Its object is to make way for their doctrine, that "Adam" (our father Adam, who brought death into our world, and all the woes attendant thereon), is the only God with whom we have to do, and to whom alone we pray, when we say, "Our Father who art in heaven." See Brigham Young's Sermon in "Zion's Watchman," Nos. 18 and 19.

What a pretty God the Mormons have gotten. Truly of them it may be said, "like father, like son." They

shew themselves worthy of their origin; "of the earth earthy." The attempt to materialize the Deity is not new. It was the practice of all the heathen world, as may be seen in their personifications of what they supposed the attributes of Deity should be; hence the various forms of idolatry. The Mormons have once more exalted the "Goddess of Reason" in their attempts to perform a task which the Word of God declares to be impossible—"Canst thou by searching find out God?"

Robert Owen, the celebrated Socialist, shewed a little more honesty of principle when, rejecting the Holy Scriptures, he boldly asserted, "it was absurd to render worship to a Being about whom we neither knew, nor could know anything." I say this assertion was more manly and honest than the Mormon procedure, as it at once told you the man and his principles.

This atomic theory has given rise to many wild, unmanageable theories, and to none more than this of Orson Pratt, that matter is possessed of the power "of changing its own state or condition." I think we should prepare for some wonderful change in our world; for if matter be "self-moving" and can "change its own state or condition," perhaps the particles of matter composing the houses in our towns may take a fit of change and become ships; or the matter of which our ships are composed, being "self-intelligent and self-moving," may hold a consultation as to the propriety of transforming themselves into water, stone, or clay, and thus leave us in the lurch, after all our trouble in preparing them for our use. The subject is really so ridiculous, that one can scarcely treat it with gravity. O, how unlike the Mormon God is the God of the Bible!

"Do not I fill heaven and earth," saith the Lord. He asks the question—"Where is the house that ye build unto me?" (Isaiah 61, 1.) This at once upsets Orson Pratt's idea of God occupying "a few cubic feet of space about the size of an ordinary man."

"God," says Elder John Jones of Sydney, "is one eternal round;" or, in the words of O. Pratt, an "eternal series;" which, in plain terms, is eternal nonsense, for to have a series you must have No. 1 to begin with, and that which has a beginning is not eternal. But if God be "one eternal round," then there has been an "eternal generation of Gods"—which is the Mormon doctrine, and thus the idea of one self-existent Being is a fallacy, and our Bible is a book of lies. Verily it is not for nothing the Mormons endeavour to sap the foundations of the divine authority of the Bible. This, infidels have in all ages attempted, but, blessed be God, their attempts are futile; they may indeed bend their bows against the Almighty, but their arrows will rebound against themselves to their utter confusion and dismay, "when the Lord ariseth to shake terribly the earth."

The greater portion of the so-called argument of the above quotations is built upon the mere supposition of the words "create and make," being synonymous terms, that is, words signifying one and the same thing; but, so far is this supposition from being correct, that we have every reason to reject it.

Firstly.—It is well ascertained that the words translated "created and made" literally means "created, *to* make;" thus we see the proper signification of "create" is to bring into being or existence that which did not pre-

viously exist; and the word "make," to put into form or arrangement that which was brought into existence.

The remarks of Dr. Adam Clarke (a witness well qualified to give evidence upon this point) may not be unacceptable to my readers. Under the word created, he has the following:—

"CREATED.—Caused existence, where previously to this moment there was no being. The rabbins, who are legitimate judges in a case of verbal criticism on their own language, are unanimous in asserting that the word *bara* expresses the commencement of the existence of a thing, or egression from nonentity to entity. It *does not* in its primary meaning denote the *preserving* or *new forming* things that had previously existed, as some imagine, but creation in the proper sense of the term, though it has some other acceptations in other places. The supposition that God formed all things out of a pre-existing, eternal nature is certainly absurd; *for if there had been an eternal nature besides an eternal* God, there must have been *two* self-existing, independent, and eternal beings, which is a most palpable contradiction."

Secondly.—We have Scriptural testimony to this distinction of signification. The Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says: "Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God; so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. xi. 3. Now, if matter is eternal, it matters not whether in separate atoms or in combinations, it must have had, eternally, "form, size, and solidity," and consequently must have appeared, or been visible. But this world was made of things which "did not appear," that is, which had neither

"form, size, nor solidity." Therefore, the matter out of which this world was made, did not exist eternally. See also Rom. iv. 17.

In these syllogistic remarks, I have used Orson Pratt's definition of matter.

The first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, when translated, according to Kimchi, Ainsworth, Buxtorf's Talmudic Lexicon, and Walton's Polyglot Bible, reads thus—"God in the beginning created the substance of the heavens and the substance of the earth, that is, the *prima materia* or first elements, out of which the heavens and the earth were successively formed." See Dr. A. Clarke.

The Mormons, when laying on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, willingly deceive their converts; for they must know that the Holy Spirit, according to their doctrines, is mere intelligence—light or power obtained by study. Nay, that the Holy Spirit is merely the promise of "eternal life—the earth and the power thereof, even the earth upon which we stand." Doc. & Cov., p. 97, sec. 7.

From this definition, which is Joseph Smith's, it appears that when they baptise in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they use the Christian form for the purpose of deception. With the forms and claims of divine truth, they entrap the unwary, and lead them on from one stage to another, until at last they get them to believe that the Elders of the Church have absolute control of the destinies of God's people;* then no doctrine, however disgusting or degrading it may be, is to be disputed or investigated. To dispute is to doubt; to investigate is to reason upon cer-

* "Millenial Star," vol. 14, pp. 274, 276,

tain premises laid down, both which states or conditions of mind are absolutely prohibited in their Church, because they well know that those who investigate their system in relation to divine revelation never join them. To doubt the words of the Elders is to question the voice of God, and therefore damnable. Doc. & Cov., pp. 158, 165, and 177.

INFALLIBILITY

Is another subject which may with propriety be noticed in this place. It is contained in the above quotation from the *Millennial Star*. Then an "ABSOLUTE CONTROL over the destinies of God's people," is claimed to be exercised by the "Presidency" and "Priesthood" of the Mormon Church. The grounds of this right to an *absolute control* is stated to be—1st, the unalterable requirements of the laws of God; and, 2nd, the constant guidance of the priesthood (in virtue of their ordination) by the Holy Ghost.

It follows, therefore, as a matter of course, that those Elders are, and must continually be, *infallible*—i.e., not liable at any time to err in judgement. For, to admit they were liable to error, would destroy their claim to absolute control. But as their doctrine of *infallibility* has various phases, it will be well to consider the various points contained in the following extracts from their own writings:—

First, then, we shall notice

COLLECTIVE INFALLIBILITY.

"You are aware that one of my counsel is gone home, therefore the first presidency here is not full, so it will be necessary that another be chosen to fill up the vacancy.

On these matters we always get the *voice of the people, the which, when it is* UNITED, IS THE VOICE OF THE LORD." See "Zion's Watchman," vol. i. p. 91.

Vox populi vox Dei is the language of the above extract. But, observe, it must be the "*united voice.*" Here, then, we have the doctrine of Infallibility taught in relation to numbers; for, although it may not matter whether many or few be present, they must be "*united,*" or infallibility ceases. Supposing, then, that twenty persons are present, and that only *one* dissents from the proposition before the meeting? Infallibility does not exist, and therefore the decision of $\frac{19}{20}$ of the assembly is not "the voice of God." What a monstrous doctrine this! If infallibility is thus measured by quantity, by what rule is the measurement to be taken? Suppose 900 persons are present, and that 10 or $\frac{1}{90}$ dissent from the proposition? Here, again, infallibility is tossed to the winds. But, supposing this same proposition be again brought before the same 900 persons, and that during the interval that has elapsed, the former dissentients are induced to change their minds, and that upon the second time of voting, a united, or in other words, unanimous vote is given, up starts Infallibility in all the panoply of her power and plenitude of her glory. Truly, this is a wonderful—a mighty transformation; 890 *fallible* erring mortals are, by the addition of 10 *equally fallible* and erring sons of Adam, transformed into *one whole infallible.* That is, 900 *nothings* make *one something;* or, in other words, 900 purblind persons become, when united in their decisions, ONE OMNISCIENT GOD. For the faculty of infallibility must, of necessity, pre-suppose the existence of the attribute

Omniscience in the being or beings claiming it. To claim infallibility for any one being or number of beings who do not possess the attribute of Omniscience, is irrational—is absurd.

Nihil tam absurdam, quod non dictum sit ab aliquo philosophorum.

In the above extract we perceive the deference that is paid to the voice of the people, and, if the subject rested here, we would be led to suppose that in the Mormon Church the people were everything, and the elders subservient to their wishes; we now come, however, to something like turning the tables. Upon the same day, and upon the same occasion that the above remarkable words were uttered by Augustus Farnham, then President of the Sydney branch, he gave utterance to the following:—

"That Paul counselled to be subject to the powers that "be, and as the Saviour said, 'Many did err not under- "standing the Scriptures;' so *I may say*, many do err not "understanding the will of the Lord. *This will is not* "*written*. The Lord said, 'I will write my law in their "hearts.' Honour the Counsel belonging to the Church "that has been *appointed by the first Presidency*. This "appointment cannot be set aside; it has also been con- "firmed by a vote of the Conference. The instructions of "this Counsel being sustained by the voice of the Confer- "ence, is the voice of the Lord." Ibid, p. 93.

In the above extract we have the following statements:—

1. Many err through ignorance of *Scripture*.
2. Many err through not understanding an *un-written* law.
3. The *un-written* is written upon their hearts.

4. The branch presidency or counsel appointed by the first president to be honored.
5. The counsel thus appointed cannot be set aside.
6. The instructions of this said counsel when backed by the voice of the people becomes the voice of the Lord.

1st Point.—What is Scripture—it comes from the Latin Scriptura, which signifies—to write—Scripture, then, is that which is written. Therefore, when Jesus said, "Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures," he condemned his hearers for not being better acquainted with the Word of the Lord *as written.* In no case does He condemn his hearers for not understanding an un-written law.

2nd Point.—We are called upon to obey the un-written will of God. If such be the case, a question naturally arises—How are we to become acquainted with this unwritten will of God. In the

3rd Point—We are told that this unwritten law is "written upon their hearts,"—the hearts of whom? If we trust the *Scriptures* for an answer they tell us—the heart of *every* believing Israelite. And the object to be obtained by God in thus writing this law upon their hearts is also clearly stated, "And they shall teach *no more* every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying know the Lord: for they shall *all* know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for *I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.*"—Jeremiah xxxi. 33, 34. Thus, then, we at once perceive a manifest contradiction between Mormonism and the Bible upon this point also. Mormonism

says, "Many err not understanding the unwritten law, although that law is written upon their hearts.

The Bible says this unwritten law will be written upon the hearts of every believing Israelite, and that they shall all so know or understand it as to require no other instructor: because they thus *know* God, and rejoice in union and communion with him. The least or humblest in the land, as well as the greatest or most exalted amongst them, are to be alike in this respect. They shall know their sins forgiven. Thus the Word of God.

But as we have seen that Mormonism contradicts the Bible upon this point, perhaps there is another contradiction connected herewith. The 4th point says: "The counsel appointed by the first presidency is to be honoured.' Why does this claim to honor follow so close upon the quotation, the law written upon their hearts—but to show the reason why honor should be given, namely—

That upon the hearts of the counsel, presidency, or priesthood, is the law of God written, and, therefore, the necessity of the people attending to priestly instruction; lest, by not understanding it they should commit sin. That this priestly exaltation is the point intended to be carried is plain from the position they claim to occupy by virtue of their appointment by the head of their Church. "*This appointment cannot be set aside.*" An hour or so before this we heard that the voice of the people was the voice of God, and dear Farnham tells them they cannot set aside his appointment. No, not if he were the greatest vagabond the earth could produce, the Conference over which he presided dare not disturb his appointment. If they wanted to remove him, they should take a journey to

the Great Salt Lake Valley, and lodge their complaint before the First Presidency, by whom alone all bishops and high priests are to be tried. "And again, *no bishop or high priest*, who shall be set apart for this ministry, *shall be tried or condemned for any crime*, save it be before the First Presidency of the Church." Doc. & Cov., p. 160. O, ye Australian Mormons, what now becomes of your *Vox populi vox Dei.* Be you ever so united in your wish to get rid of a wicked president (if you should have one), your union will not avail you. No! no infallibility in your decisions now. You have no local power by which to rid you of a depraved president. O, awake—examine the slavery to which you have subjected yourselves. No civil liberty for you! You *dare not* interfere with the appointments of your rulers.

You are told that your united voice is the voice of God, but have you considered what the circumstances are under which this apparently great privilege is conceded to you. It is only when you agree with the instructions given by your Presidency or Council. This you will find to be the case if you examine the subject of our last or 6th point. "The instructions of *this Council* being sustained by the voice of the Conference, is the voice of the Lord." Here, again, we have infallibility under another form. The decisions of the Conference and the Council united become the voice of God; but suppose a wicked president gives counsel with which the Conference disagrees, there is no authority attached to the vote. And as you possess no power to meddle with his appointment, he may act as independently of you as he does when establishing his mission, and you are bound by the rules of your associa-

tion to obey his mandates, if he utters them in the name of the Lord: as, according to the laws of your Church, each individual member of the priesthood is the voice of God to the people, or, in other words, infallible. When, therefore, they tell you that the "voice of Conference is the voice of God," it is but a sham—a mockery, by which these arrant imposters puff up the minds of their followers, to lead them off the scent, and thus draw them, by degrees, into the most debasing slavery; a slavery which debases reason, thereby trampling in the dust that birthright of every man—LIBERTY. They profess to give you liberty, and free you from the galling yoke of priestcraft and priestly aggrandisement.

"The world," says President Richards, "is enslaved *by priestcraft* and superstition, *which darken the mind*, and destroy the *capacity* of the soul, and a just sense of the obligations men are under to one another, both in their temporal and spiritual relations." "Mill. Star," vol. xiv. p. 277.

Bear in mind, these kind-hearted, benevolent, and philanthropic elders of the Mormon Church, lament the sad effects of priestly rule and government throughout the world. What sort of tears have they shed? Did their weeping arise from cutting onions, or rather have they not shed what are proverbially called "crocodile tears?" The following extracts will shew:—

INDIVIDUAL INFALLIBILITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

"And, behold, and lo, this is an ensample unto all those who are ordained unto this priesthood, whose mission is appointed unto them to go forth; and this is the ensample unto them, that they shall speak as they

are moved by the Holy Ghost, and whatsoever they shall speak, when moved upon by the Holy Ghost, shall be *Scripture, shall be the will of the Lord, shall be the mind of the Lord, shall be the Word of the Lord, shall be the* VOICE *of the Lord, and the power of God unto salvation :* behold this is the promise of the Lord unto you, O be my servants."—Doc. and Cov. pp. 158-9.

In the above we have the following points :—

1. The positive promise of the Holy Spirit to all the priesthood.
2. Whatsoever they shall speak shall be the will of the Lord, and the power of God unto salvation.

My dear Mormon readers, do you not see the error into which you were led in supposing you possessed the slightest power in the Church of which you are members. You have a Conference, it is true, but of what use is it ? whatever your president says, you must agree to, as you have already acknowledged him to be the "Voice of God," and whatsoever he says is, therefore, and must be law, for by resisting him you would professedly be resisting "the mind, the will," "the Word, and the Voice of God" : and in so doing you would reject, what, by your connection, you acknowledge to be the "power of God unto salvation."

The claim set forth in the above quotation is a very important one. Inspiration direct from heaven, giving a positive claim to absolute "control over the destinies of God People."

Before such a claim can be substantiated, evidence of a stronger nature than mere assertion must be produced. Any person may say he is inspired. We,

therefore, as rational and accountable creatures, have a right to enquire. What evidence do you produce, that I may examine it and test it in the crucible of reason, guided by the word of revelation we already have ?

You answer, "we are called with the same calling as were the Apostles in the time of Christ, and therefore are in possession of the same power and authority."

Again reason rejoins. If you were called, as were the Apostles of old, and possess the same authority, why do you not produce testimonials of the same character, viz.—Working all manner of miracle ?

You answer, " We have the gifts of healing amongst us, but are not permitted to exercise that power upon any who have not faith to be healed, and also desire it."

Reason—guided by the history of Christ and his Apostles, replies:—This position destroys your premises, as the Apostles of Christ went forth amongst the unbelievers and healed all manner of diseases, for the purpose of attesting the divine origin of their doctrine and authority ; and that such was the effect produced, is evident from the rapid spread of the Christian doctrine, as well as from such expressions as the following: " We know thou art a teacher come from God : for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." When, then, and not till then, Mr. Mormon, you can do this, you may present your claim to absolute authority.

Let us now look at another link in this chain of infallibility. In an article concerning the orderly government of the Church, we read, " the exercise of every function of the body or priesthood produces life as its legitimate fruit, and thus salvation flows unto the people." " And those saints who can commit their souls' salvation unto the

priesthood, but cannot their money, are making a mock of their profession, and fooling away their time."

Again, "Be not over anxious, but be ye ready to respond to the counsel of God's servants, who control the destinies of His people." "Millennial Star," vol. 14, pp. 273, 275, 276.

The following is from the address of Heber C. Kernball, delivered in the Tabernacle, Great Salt Lake City, April 2nd, 1854:—

"God will not be trifled with; neither will his servants; "their words have got to be fulfilled, and they are the "men that are to *mould* you."

From these extracts we learn—

1. The priesthood constitute the body or Church.
2. The orderly exercise of their office is life producing.
3. That this life works salvation in the people.

It may, perhaps, be objected, that the disjunctive "or" between the words "Body and Priesthood," does not make the two words identical. If such is not the intention, why place them in contrast with "people?"

4. That as the salvation of the soul is in the hands of the priesthood, so also is the disposal of the money of each member of the Church.
5. That our minds are to be *moulded* by the priesthood.

If we had no other evidence of the slavish tendency of Mormonism than the above five points, there is sufficient in these to stamp the Mormon system as the most despotic that ever existed upon the earth. The Mormon priesthood thus declare, that unless they have the absolute control even of all the money, it is no use for any to remain members of society. Away, away for ever then with

Orson Pratt's tirade against priestly domination and its consequent evils. O, ye Mormon rulers—hypocritical declaimers against the tyranny of the priesthood of Christendom; how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Ye come with the clothing of liberty—calling upon all to cast off their chains—assert their freedom of thought—judge all things for themselves, and enter into the liberty of the children of God; but, as soon as your victims are fast within the fair formed net you have cast around them, *freedom is no more!*—liberty of thought vanishes—the priesthood are infallible — salvation flows from them; they, therefore, have absolute control of the souls and bodies of their victims. Hence, your followers must not—dare not think for themselves.

O, Popery, Popery, under another name! How thou dost struggle to *exalt* the clergy and *depress* the laity—destroying freedom of action wherever thy government is submitted to!

How unlike the apostles of the meek and lowly Jesus. They, although proving the infallibility of their doctrine by numerous signs and wonders, in healing the sick and raising the dead to life, would not be "*lords* over God's heritage." They did not claim the right to dispose of the people's money: "Is it not thine own, and in thine own power?" was their language. See the Apostle Paul, working with his own hands to support himself. Was this lording it over the people's money? St. Paul's highest ambition was to depress himself and exalt his Master. He desired to be a "fellow helper of the people on their way to eternal glory. Jesus, and Jesus alone, was ever held up to view. No trusting to the infallibility of the

preacher at the expense of private judgment. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," was their constant injunction, with a full assurance, that if they laid aside every weight and their besetting sins, steadily looking unto Jesus, they would have an unction from the Holy One, even the Spirit of Truth, to guide them into all truth. Reader, is it thus with you.

The Mormon system differs from Popery in its idea of infallibility in a very material point. Popery has not yet settled the question as to whether infallibility resides in the Pope as an attribute of his office, in a general council, or in both united. But as we have shown Mormonism claims infallibility for each of its members when they unite in carrying a proposition—they then become the "voice of God," then we have the infallibility of the priesthood, of course in a higher degree, otherwise they could not claim the right to "control the destinies" of the people. "Your conscience is mine," then, is the language of the Mormon priesthood as well as of the Church of Rome. But what saith the Scripture?—"We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: so, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. xiv.

To consider the influence of the higher grades of infallibility, as possessed by the quorum of the seventy, and the twelve apostles, and the bishops, is needless, as it all flows from one source or centre—UNIVERSAL BISHOPRICK.

"I will be merciful unto you, for I have given unto you the kingdom, and the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom shall not be taken from my servant, Joseph Smith, junior." So says Joseph Smith, see Doc. & Cov., p. 155.

"I MYSELF hold the keys of this last dispensation, and

WILL FOR EVER HOLD THEM, both in time and in eternity." Prophet, pp. 195, 196.

This bangs the Pope. Poor old Pope has claimed infallibility whilst walking on *terra firma*, and asserted his right to rule in "heaven, earth, and hell," but never to authority over the Church after he died. Not so, however, is it with Joe Smith—he rules in eternity also. The Pope does not appoint his own successor, into him infallibility is crammed by the majority of the conclave of Cardinals. How any number of acknowledged fallibles can cram infallibility into one of their own number is a nut too hard for common sense to crack. Here again the Pope is outdone. Joe Smith appoints his own successor, and "none other is to be attended to"—Doc. & Cov., p. 130. Query—Did Joe Smith ordain Brigham Young? If not, the Mormons have no leader.

The poor Pope has been called Antichrist, and truly there are, and have been "many Antichrists;" but the Apostle speaks of a character that in its embodiement shall exalt *himself* above all that is called God, or that is worshipped or honoured. Is not this Joe Smith? Are not all the principles of Anti-Christianism centred in him? He claims the government of this dispensation in the spirit world, and consequently is the source of the measure of infallibility that rests on, or dwells in Brigham Young (the present leader); and he also is the source of infallibility to the priesthood, which they receive by virtue of their appointment from him. Here then is a new doctrine—the transmission of infallibility. Truly, brother Pidgeon was right when he took as a text, "*Mormonism is a lie.*"

But then the Mormons may here object, "Sir, you do

us wrong in speaking thus of our claim to infallibility by virtue of our appointment. True, we must be regularly ordained; but then we are under the constant guidance of the Holy Spirit, whom you acknowledge as the guide into all truth." True, Mr. Mormon, we acknowledge the Holy Spirit as the guide into all truth: but then, how can he possess this knowledge and power if he is not a perfect being? Your Holy Spirit is something gained by study—not the direct influence of God upon the believer's heart, instructing him in things to come. By the use you make of the Holy Spirit of the Bible you only lie in wait to deceive. You under the influence of the Holy Spirit? Yes, truly, but it is the one of your own creating; for you boldly tell us he is not yet a complete God. "He also *may* obtain glory with the Father, even as Jesus does. *Yea, a fulness of the Godhead by himself.*" (Spencer's letters, p. 64.) Here, then, you advance a step further to direct atheism, and resolve all creative energy and directing power into mere intelligence, and thus every intelligent being is the Holy Spirit, because that signifies light or intelligence.

I feel it very difficult to condense my thoughts upon this point. Priestly dominion is an awful theme—a tremendous power to be exercised by any man; but, blessed be God we need not believe it—the Bible is against it. The following extract from Weaver's View of Puseyism shall conclude this part of our subject:—

"See the Puseyite clergyman of a parish. He assumes to himself the direction, the sole direction of his parishioners in their eternal concerns. He alone has a right to make them "members of Christ, Children of God, and in-

122

heritors of the kingdom of heaven" by the sacrament of baptism, which, as administered by him of the apostolical succession, not only regenerates them, but justifies, and sanctifies, and confers upon them all spiritual blessings. No one but himself has authority to instruct them in the way of salvation, or to direct them in the way to heaven. At length, they draw near to their final account, when it becomes all-important that they have "administered to them," as it is termed, "the consolations of religion." He reads the prayers and service appointed, administers to them the sacrament, which, in his hands, communicates "life" to the soul, and having pronounced the absolution of their sin as professing to be penitent and believing, he dismisses them for heaven. Now, what is the obvious tendency of such power as this upon the mind? Feeling that their everlasting interests are in so great a degree in his hands, they must, of course, look up to him with a sort of awe, bordering upon dread; nor will they dare to displease him. Nothing remains for them but an implicit obedience to his injunctions, and the reception of his sayings as unerring truth. And still more will this be the case, if he can persuade the congregation of his hearers that he is a "successor of the apostles," that there is an efficacy in the sacraments as administered by him; and that, by his consecration of the elements, he can bring down the presence of Christ in the bread and wine! How sacred must be the person of such a man! Can any one doubt then that these tenets exalt the power of the clergy? That they minister to the pride and ambition of the human heart?"

"It may not be amiss to remark that it was not on

such grounds as the above, did Paul require that the Christians at Thessalonica should "esteem highly in love" those that were "over them in the Lord;" not on such grounds did he himself claim the regard of those to whom he wrote. He could appeal to the Ephesian Bishops (επισκοπους) that, when amongst them, he had been "serving the Lord with all humility of mind; and to the church over whom they had been made bishops, in writing to them, he calls himself "less than the least of all saints." And, when writing to the Corinthian Church, it will be seen that he possesses the same spirit. Hence he uses such expressions as these—"I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God, that giveth the increase." Again, "Not I, but the grace of God that was with me." "By the grace of God I am that I am."

"The doctrines of grace, such as free forgiveness in the name of Christ, justification freely by grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, salvation by grace through faith, and eternal life as the gift of God, when rightly understood and believed by a convinced sinner, will burst the bonds of sin, and break the bonds of Satan; and by causing the Holy Spirit to take possession of the soul will introduce it into a state of sacred freedom: and the soul will delightfully say in consequence, "O Lord, truly I am thy servant, I am thy servant—thou hast loosed my bonds." But what else will produce such freedom? Not assuredly the sacraments—the belonging to the so-called Apostolical Church—or a rigid adherence to rites and ceremonies, &c., without the mind being informed, or an

intelligent faith produced. These sacraments, these adherences, in themselves have no adaptation for the purpose. They communicate no knowledge, they give no understanding, they impart no true faith, they bring no promises to the mind, that is well-applied promises, to fill it with joy and peace in believing, nor can, in such cases, "the joy of the Lord be our strength." Should the conscience of a man be awakened, what must he do? 'Do,' says a Puseyite, 'he must repent and believe, it is true; but by all means he must comfort himself with his baptism, with his relation to the true Church, and he must take the Lord's supper, and pray, and do as well as he can. But what adaptation is there in all this to ease his conscience, and set his mind at liberty? If he were led to the cross of Christ, and shown that therein God's holiness was cleared, his justice satisfied, his law established, so that with infinite "wisdom and prudence," God can "glorify his mercy" in pardoning and saving the chief of sinners, there would indeed be something to relieve him: but not so in the way above specified. And then, what adaptation is there in adverting to sacraments, to church relation, to the power of the ministry to induce him to renounce his former servitude of sin, and to live as "the Lord's freeman?" Ah, an apostle would teach us that it is the blood of Christ believed in, that, while it "purges the conscience from dead works," disposes "to serve the living God." This sacramental religion, this trusting to the church and its ministry, therefore, not only keeps the sinner in his state of slavery, but stands in the way of his being brought out into the 'liberty' of 'the Spirit of God.'

"But there is a direct mental bondage produced by

this Puseyism or High-churchism. What is its language? 'To the episcopal clergy, and to them alone, belong the ministry of the word and sacraments; and your salvation is in great danger, to say the least, if you attend to other ministrations.' Suppose, then, that a man lives in a parish wherein such a clergyman resides. As his parishioner, he must then receive him as his sole spiritual guide. The man, of course, if he is convinced of sin, will desire a 'servant of the most high God,' who can and will 'show him the way to salvation;" but, alas! it so happens, that his 'authorized' guide does not know the way himself. Again; the parishioner may be already in the way, and wishes to be furthered in it—the same difficulty occurs. The clergyman neither is in it, or knows it, and of course is utterly unfit to guide or lead others, And yet he must attend his parish church, and sit under his ministry? Is not this bondage? Does not such Puseyism and High-churchism tend to enslave the mind? But what makes it more grievous—in the same parish there is a ministry where I may not only learn the way of salvation, but may be furthered in it; and under which I may be quickened, comforted, and established; but the minister is an 'unauthorized teacher'—'it is dangerous to hear him"—if he hears him, he not only endangers his salvation, but the clergyman, the esquire, the churchwardens—all become his enemy; and whatever charities may exist in the parish he shall not partake of them. Is not all this calculated to bring his mind into a state of slavery?—yes, of complete slavery. Nor is this all: the unhappy man has a feeling for his neighbours who are in the same wretched situation! The good Lord, in His mercy, inter-

pose to deliver our fellow creatures and fellow countrymen from such thraldom!

"The tenet concerning the necessity, or, at least, the general necessity of the sacraments, urged as they are as necessary to salvation, induces mental slavery. A child is born to a parishioner—it is unexpectedly seized with convulsions—it is on the point of death—that it may be saved, it must be baptized; but lo, the minister who alone can administer the ordinance effectually is not at hand! The father, the mother, the nurse, are all of them concerned for the future welfare of the child—but what can they do? They wait, and wait, and wait in vain; and the child has expired without the saving rite! Is not an exposure to such a state of mind, a bondage? Yes; even though the parents may hope that the will will be taken for the deed. The same may be said in the case of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as to its administration to the dying. Both the dying man himself and his attendant friends may suffer greatly in their minds, having been taught by their minister to lay such stress upon the sacraments.

"Moreover, I must surrender, it seems, my private judgment to the judgment of the Church and to my minister, and believe as they believe. This doctrine may very well accord with the feelings of the slothful, who will not take the trouble to think for themselves; but to one who knows how to value his intelligent and voluntary nature, and who deems himself responsible for the use of his intellects and will, it must necessarily be repulsive; and perpetually to have enforced upon his belief what he deems absurd and unscriptural can be considered as nothing less

than a state of bondage. Yes, God has made me a free agent; my body may be imprisoned, my mouth may be gagged, but my mind must think; and if I am not allowed to think freely, I am in bondage; and this bondage becomes more intolerable, when I consider that the God who made me, and gave me my thinking powers, requires me to search the Scriptures for myself, to see whether the things I am told are so or not—requires me to 'prove all things and to hold fast to that which is good,' and not to 'believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they are of God.' If, then, I find myself forbidden by man to think and judge, while I am required to do both by my Maker, am I not held in mental bondage? But, 'whether it be right to hearken unto man rather than unto God,' let the reader judge."

III.

The statement referred to is as follows:—"When the Father made proposals concerning the salvation of man, when he should sin on the earth, Jesus offered to redeem all who would repent and keep a celestial law; *Lucifer*, a YOUNGER BROTHER, offered to save all; Jesus's offer was accepted by the Father, and Lucifer's was rejected; and yet Lucifer's proposition appeared so plausible—so much more liberal, noble, benevolent, and kind-hearted—that *one third* part of the sons of God believed it and joined Lucifer's standard.

"That was what made division in Heaven, and war followed; Lucifer, with *one third* of the spirits in Heaven, which he drew around him by his sophistry and false philanthropy, declared war against Jesus and the *two thirds*

that rallied round his standard to maintain the truth; and they fought until Lucifer and his followers were overcome, and cast out of Heaven, even unto the earth, and were cursed with this curse, even that they *should not receive unto themselves bodies* on the earth, like the *two thirds* who maintained their integrity, and fought by the side of Jesus.

"This curse came through imbibing and exercising a false spirit—a sympathising spirit—a spirit that will sympathise with misery or punishment, when misery is justly due by punishment. Lucifer made his followers believe that he was a far more tender hearted and merciful being than Jesus, and got all he could to help him sympathise for the miseries that must follow the abominable crimes of man on the earth; that they went it for salvation any how—right or wrong; they were so good—so holy, and so benevolent—they could not do otherwise.

"But what is the benevolence of Heaven—the sympathy of the Holy Ones in such matters? *Down to hell, where* DAVID *went. Down to hell, ye murderers!* Ye whose sins cannot be pardoned—ye have taken the blood of your fellows, and ye can't restore it. Therefore, howl ye, for hot wrath is upon you, and he that sitteth in the heavens will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh." "Millennial Star," vol. 14, p. 278.

Reader, I will not tire you with further quotations from this precious article! The above paragraphs give the whole spirit of the subject. From it we learn the following particulars:—

First—That God held a council with the spirits of men, as to what should be done with man—or, in

other words, themselves, when they would sin on the earth.

Now, this idea of a council—of war, we might call it—is in direct opposition to the doctrine of pre-science, as taught in the Word of God. "Who hath directed the spirit of the Lord: or, being His counsellor hath taught? With whom took He counsel? and who instructed Him, and taught Him in the path of judgment: and taught Him knowledge, and shewed to Him the way of understanding?" Isaiah xl. 13, 14. The whole of the chapter is in direct opposition to Mormon ideas of Deity.

Secondly—We learn that Lucifer, or the Devil, was the younger brother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now this idea contradicts the doctrine of the essential divinity of the Lord Jesus, as taught in the Holy Scriptures. "For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him. And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." Col. i. 16, 17.

Thirdly—We learn that if the Devil had his will, not one soul would be lost.

Now this idea is in direct opposition to the character given of him by the Word of God. "Be sober, be vigilant; because your ADVERSARY the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour." 1 Peter v. 8.

"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts (or desires) of your father ye will do. He was a *murderer* from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because

there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for *he is a liar*, and the father of it." John viii. 44.

Fourthly—We learn that philanthropy, or man love, caused war in Heaven, and that the poor Devil was beaten, because Jesus had two to fight against his (the Devil's) one. Let the reader bear in mind that, according to Mormon doctrine, these were the *spirits of men* fighting against their brother spirits in the *spirit world.*

Now this idea contradicts the victorious character of Christ in *single combat*, as given in the Holy Scriptures.

"I have trodden the wine-press ALONE, and of the people there was NONE with me; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me." Isa. lxiii. 35.

"For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that HE might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John iii. 8; Heb. ii. 14, 15; Isa. xxv. 8.

Here the Mormons may object—Is it not written in your Scriptures that there was "war in Heaven—that Michael and his angels fought against the Devil and his angels, and beat them, and cast them out into the earth?" Rev. xii. 7—13.

I answer. The battle there described has yet to take place; this is evident from its connexion with the context, and the careful reader will see that it is prophetic of the future purgation of the Church through the fire of persecution, and also the final triumph of truth over error.

But the Mormons, by their own doctrine, are shut out from such objection; because they never apply the name Michael to Jesus, but to Adam, as the supreme God of this world, and to whom alone we are to pray.

Fifthly—We learn that all who sympathise with their fellow men in misery are followers of the Devil.

"Sympathise!" What is this so-called devilish principle? Why, it is to be affected by the feelings of another—to have mutual feeling.

Now the condemnation of such feelings contradicts the teachings of God's Word. "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink." Matt. vii. 12; Rom. xii. 20.

Sixthly—We are here taught that murder is an unpardonable sin.

Now this idea also contradicts the whole tenor of the Word of God. For Jesus prayed for his murderers, saying—"Father, FORGIVE them, for they know not what they do." John xxiii. 34. The martyr Stephen, in the moment of death, prayed for his murderers. "Lord, LAY NOT this sin to their charge." Acts vii. 60. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Matt. v. 44, 45.

Seventhly—We are here taught, that because of the murder David committed, he was sent to hell.

Now this idea is also in direct opposition to the plain statements of the Bible. "And Nathan said unto David, the LORD also hath PUT AWAY thy sin; thou shalt not die." 1 Sam. xii. 13.

To put away sin is to pardon it, which implies that, although the temporal consequences of our transgressions·

may continue, yet the spiritual punishment is removed, and a clear sense of such removal imprinted on the mind. This David rejoiced in—"I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Ps. xxxii. 5. This the believer in the present day rejoices in. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John i. 9.

Eighthly—From the entire quotation we learn that the Mormon system is utter selfishness—that benevolence has no part or lot in their arrangements; thus stamping their system as being, in every sense of the word, "earthly, sensual, and devilish." "Devilish" for malignity in all its withering power, is Mormonism. No wonder then that we hear of such deeds of darkness having been committed and sanctioned by their leading men in their own dear land of Deseret, as the following statement of *One Hundred and Fifteen Emigrants* who spent a winter at Salt Lake when on their way to California testifies:—

"5—That the summary manner in which persons are sometimes *privately despatched and put out of the way, without trial, judge, or jury, if they happen to be obnoxious to the Mormon Church, is abhorrent to humanity, recreant of justice, and unworthy of a civilised and Christian people.* 6—That the system of having a class of persons called 'Danites,' appointed for the express purpose of pursuing obnoxious individuals not only throughout their own dominions, but to other countries, in order to *privately despatch them*, is *murderous*, and in imitation of the savage, who with *relentless* hate pursues his victim to

death." Extract from a series of Resolutions published in California, A.D. 1851.

How unlike the Godlike system of self-sacrificing benevolence as taught by our Saviour Jesus. "Who though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich." And requires all his followers to carry out this self-sacrificing principle in their lives. "If thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink."

I have been thus particular in placing before my readers this general view of the tendencies of Mormonism, to prepare them for the consideration of some other of their doctrines, which will be referred to in the sequel.

IV.

For the convenience of comparison with my reply I have numbered the paragraphs of this letter. Who Jones means by my *prompter* I know not, nor am I conscious of being prompted to my present course of conduct by any person. The development and maintenance of truth being my sole object.

V.

The quotations I have made clearly state the writer's object. The careful reader will see by my reply, that Jones does not regard truth. His only object in this paragraph is to gain a point by misrepresentation; but what other can we expect from men who believe that God commanded falsehood.

VI.

"The grand question of difference" is not "revelation" simply considered; but are the pretensions which the Mormons make to the possession of revelation well established. The fact that, in order to establish their claims, they endeavour to make the public discredit our Bible, shews their utter inability to prove the truth of their system.

Infidels have always endeavoured to sap the foundations of Christianity by upsetting, if they could, the authority of our Scriptures, and raise upon its ruins the "baseless fabric of a vision," leaving a miserable wreck behind.

True the Book of Mormon is, professedly, a translation of certain ancient records which were engraved upon plates having the appearance of gold; and three persons, Harriss, Cowdry, and Whitmer, declare that after this translation was complete, an angel shewed them the plates, and declared that Joseph Smith had translated the writings which they saw upon them. See testimony, Book of Mormon, p. 5.

Of this testimony, Orson Pratt in his pamphlet on the "Evidences of the Bible and Book of Mormon Compared," makes good use. In the fifth section he asks the question—"Is there not a possibility that these four* witnesses are all wicked impostors who have colleagued together to deceive mankind? We answer, that there would be a possibility if there were no other evidences to confirm their testimony. But when we take into considera-

* He here includes Joe Smith.

tion the boldness of their testimony, and the circumstances connected with it, there is NO PROBABILITY THAT THEY WERE WICKED MEN."

Now, this answer plainly and unequivocally contradicts *two separate* statements made by Joseph Smith concerning Martin Harriss. The thirtieth section of the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" professes to be a *revelation* given in July, 1828, in which Martin Harriss is called a "WICKED man." This statement is repeated in the thirty-sixth section of the same book, in a *revelation* given May, 1829. It is again repeated three times in the 27th chapter of "Joseph Smith the Prophet;" a book written by Smith's mother. It is again repeated in the "Millennial Star," vol. 8, p. 124.

Well, what shall we say to this contradictory account? Orson Pratt, one of their *divinely inspired* (?) Twelve Apostles, says there was no probability of these men being wicked. *Two revelations* with 10 months between them, positively assert that Martin Harriss was a "*wicked* man."

Now these revelations are true, or they are false. If true, then Orson Pratt knowingly wrote a falsehood. But if Orson Pratt has stated the truth, then these so-called revelations are false, and Joseph Smith is thereby proved to be an impostor.

Let the reader bear in mind that these revelations were given during the progress of the professed translation.

Again, Oliver Cowdry was one of those three witnesses upon whose testimony so much stress is laid. Concerning him, there is a revelation stating that he was not faithful

enough to be trusted alone with the papers and monies of the Society. Doc. & Cov., sec. 28, date 1831.

Now, this so-called revelation plainly charges Oliver Cowdry with *dishonest* intentions, and is either true or false. If true, then Orson Pratt wrote a wilful falsehood when he said there was no probability of Cowdry's being a wicked man. But if Orson Pratt has written the truth, then Joseph Smith is the liar, and thus proved to be an impostor.

The Mormons may take which side they please. Orson Pratt, in the ninth section of the tract referred to, attempts to shift his ground, and argues that, supposing all the witnesses were the worst of men, it would not invalidate the testimony they gave concerning the truth of the Book of Mormon previous to their departure from the paths of virtue; inasmuch as the whoredom and murder committed by David, and the perfidy of Peter in denying his Master, did not invalidate their previous testimony to the truth of the revelations they had previously received.

This argument may be very specious, but it is built upon false premises. So far from the character of the witnesses having nothing to do with the truth or falsehood of the system which they promulgate, it has everything to do with it; for if men whose character is uniformly evil propound any system of a moral nature, it is unreasonable and contrary to experience to suppose them actuated by pure motives, unless we are willing to admit that light and darkness are identical.

To refer to the case of David, reminds one of the idea of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. David

was not an habitual liar and murderer; of his deep and heartfelt repentance and sorrow for his sins we have ample evidence in the Bible. He did not attempt to bolster up his iniquitous conduct by pretended revelations as Joe Smith has done. In every State in which Joe Smith resided, his *universal character* was that of a "*liar* and *swindler*." It is contrary to common sense to argue, in the face of such testimony, that Joe Smith was an honest and holy man, unless we suppose, what is clearly impossible, that the majority of the inhabitants of all those States had combined for the purpose of traducing his character.

Again. The reference to the Apostle Peter denying his Lord and Master is a very unhappy one for the truthfulness of Orson Pratt. At the time Peter denied Christ, he was ignorant of his real character. It is a well-known fact, that until after Christ's resurrection, the Apostles did not understand the nature of their Master's mission. They trusted in the power of their Messiah to elevate the Jewish people above all the nations of the earth.* No wonder then that they, in this most critical trial of their faith, should give way.

But, further, Orson Pratt has knowingly put Peter's testimony concerning the glory of Christ upon the Mount of Transfiguration in a false position, by placing this testimony before his denial of his Master.

Now, the contrary is the fact, as neither Peter, James, nor John, gave any testimony about this affair until after the resurrection of Christ. This silence they maintained

---

* Luke xxiv. 13—21; Acts i. 6.

in obedience to their Master's command. Matt. xvii. 9; Mark ix. 9; Luke ix. 36. Concerning Peter's repentance for his sin and acceptance with his Master, we have abundant evidence in the New Testament. Matt. xxvi. 69—75; John xxi. 15—17.

Therefore, the argument for the divine authority of the Book of Mormon, which Orson Pratt attempts to raise upon this false position, tumbles to the ground.

It matters not what a man *was*, but what he *is* when he comes before the public to give evidence in matters of importance. Will any court of judicature take the evidence of a man for the honesty of another, when it is well known that he is himself a swindler? Certainly not.

This attempt of O. Pratt's to build an argument upon so absurd an idea, stamps his character as a religious swindler of no mean order.

As I intend, in a separate pamphlet, to answer his divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon, I shall close these observations with Martin Harriss's statement after he left the Mormon Church. When asked if he had actually seen the gold plates, he said—"*He did not see them with his* NATURAL eyes; *he only saw them in his mind.*" In other words, he imagined they existed because Joseph Smith had told him they did.

"Here deception was practised by the witnesses in pretending that they saw gold plates, when, in point of fact, they never saw any, and none existed. Prevarication was employed in using language which, according to its obvious and legitimate import, conveyed the idea that

they saw with their eyes what they saw only with the mind or imagination."

VII.

These two paragraphs contradict each other. The 16th says, I shall be met on my own proposition. The 17th states a proposition totally different from mine. My own proposition is contained in my letter to Wandell; I did not relinquish it—nor will I. Before I attempt to build the house, I must have the foundation well laid. I do say, and I believe what I say, that infidelity in its most dreadful aspect is Mormonism.

There is something in a name. In ancient times, a name was always descriptive of character or circumstance —so with the word *Mormon*. It means something terrible in its nature—that which is calculated to scare or frighten; a place where wild beasts congregate together. This we learn from the 180th page of the Book of Mormon, which reads thus—"And it came to pass, that as many as did believe him (Alma), did go forth to a place which was called Mormon, having received its name from the king; being in the borders of the land, and having been infested by times, or at seasons, by wild beasts."

The Greek word *Mormo*, means—"Bugbear." Oh, who would be a Mormon!

The 18th paragraph depends upon the 17th, and as I have shewn that to be false, I regard this as unworthy of notice.

VIII.

See my reply to Jones's first letter.

IX.

Mr. Jones was present when I made the statement he pretends to quote, and therefore I have said he knew I did not make it.

This course of misrepresentation is no new thing in Mormon history, for they can say and unsay when it suits their purpose. Witness the 12th paragraph of their confession of faith, as given in the Appendix to "Doctrine and Covenants," p. 334 :—"We believe it just to preach the gospel to the nations of the earth, and warn the righteous to save themselves from the corruption of the world; *but we do not believe it right to interfere with bond servants, neither preach the gospel to, nor baptize them,* CONTRARY TO THE WILL AND WISH of *their masters, nor to meddle with* or influence them in the least to cause them to be dissatisfied with their situations in this life, thereby jeopardizing the lives of men; such interference we believe to be unlawful and unjust, and dangerous to the peace of every Government allowing human beings to be held in servitude."

A flat contradiction to the above will be seen in the following pretended revelation, as given February, 1831: —"*Lift up your voices and spare not, call upon the nations to repent, both old and young, both* BOND and *free*, saying, prepare yourselves for the great day of the Lord." The reader will at once perceive the contradiction referred to. This revelation says—"Call upon BOND and FREE." In the 12th paragraph of their political creed, as above quoted, they tell us that they do not believe it right to preach the gospel to, nor baptize *bond servants*.

Now, this revelation is either true or false. If true, then the statement contained in their political creed is false; for they are diametrically opposed to each other.

Again: If their political creed contain their real sentiments, then this supposed revelation must be false, and thus Joseph Smith and all his coadjutors are proved to be liars and impostors, who will vary their creed to suit the circumstances in which they may be placed.

The fact that they thus publicly declare, they must wait for the slave-holder to give his consent before they will preach to, or baptize any of their slaves, demonstrates the *time-serving* character of their mission. How unlike the unflinching boldness of the heralds of the Cross in the first ages of Christianity, or the burning zeal of Missionaries in our own day.

So time-serving, in fact, was Joe Smith, that at one time he would not allow even "free people of colour to join his Church."

X.

The quotation referred to, beginning at the 5th paragraph of second section, Doc. & Cov., p. 8:—"We shall now proceed to examine the situation of man at his first creation. Moses, the historian, has given us the following account of him in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, beginning with the 20th verse, and closing with the 30th. We copy from the *new translation*."

The quotation on the 11th page begins thus:—"We next proceed to present the account of the direct revelation which man received after he was cast out of Eden, and further copy from the *new translation*."

The fact that Jones was in possession of those extracts from the *newly revealed* translation of our Bible, and yet denied the existence of such a book; and the fact that Wandell, the then President of their Australian Mission, allowed such a denial to be publicly made, and that officially too; whilst at the same time, a part, at least, of *that translation* was in PRINT, shews them to be men unworthy of credit, in a religious point of view. The system which requires to be bolstered up with falsehood must be rotten at its core, and has its rise in Communist or Socialist principles.

That this is the foundation of Mormonism is evident from their system of Polygamy, or many wives, and the manner in which they endeavour to hide it from public notice.

Wandell, that Arch-apostle of infidelity in these colonies, *unblushingly* and *publicly* denied that such a doctrine was held by them. While, at the same time, he well knew that it was practised and preached at Salt Lake Valley, in accordance with a professed revelation given to Joseph Smith at Nauvoo, on the 12th July, 1843; in which he took good care that he should be first served with virgins, reserving to himself and all future "First Presidents" the sole right of giving away virgins. See "Zion's Watchman," Nos. 2 and 3, Sydney, September 24, 1853.

But Wandell and Jones were not alone in the uttering of this *notorious* falsehood; for they had the authority of the First Presidency and Council of their Church so to do. As will be seen from the following extract from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, under the head of Marriage,

page 330:—" You both mutually agree to be each other's companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves *wholly for each other*, and *from* ALL *others*, during your lives." " May God add His blessings and *keep you to fulfill your covenants*, from henceforth and for ever. Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the CRIME of *fornication* and POLYGAMY, we declare that we believe *that one man should have* ONE wife, and one woman but one husband; except in case of death, when either are at liberty to marry again."

This denial of the doctrine was published in the stereotyped third European edition, in A.D. 1852, just NINE YEARS after the command to practice polygamy was given. Does not this barefaced denial of their real sentiments prove that the whole of the Mormon rulers are a set of *infidels*, whose only aim is, by a show of piety and seeming reverence for divine truth, to gull the unwary and induce them to emigrate to " Salt Lake," and thus build up in the next generation a community of sworn enemies to the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

This system appears to me to be the last effort of his infernal majesty to root out genuine Christianity from the face of the earth. Long has he tried open and avowed infidelity. He has had in his service men of no ordinary talent, yet he has failed—yea, and will fail to accomplish his object. The wit of Voltaire—the learned mythology of a Volney—the bombastic style of a Paine—the sly insinuations of a Hume or a Gibbon — the objections of a Woolston, Tindal, and Collins — and the open

atheism of an Owen, have fallen short of their mark.

To return. The argument sustained by Orson Pratt is very clear—showing much ingenuity in that style of argument called "begging the question;" and is founded upon the so-called revelation given by Joe Smith. The following paragraph of which, will fully illustrate the position they take :—

"Abraham received concubines, and they bare him children, and *it* was *accounted unto him* for righteousness, because they were GIVEN unto him, and he abode in my law; as Isaac also, and Jacob, did none other things than that which they were *commanded;* and because they did none other things than that which they were commanded, they have entered into their exaltation, according to the promises, and sit upon thrones: *and are not angels, but* GODS. DAVID also received *many wives* and concubines, as also SOLOMON and Moses my servant, as also many others of my servants, from the beginning of creation until this time; and in NOTHING DID THEY SIN, save in those things which they received not of me." "DAVID'S wives and concubines were *given* unto him of me, by the hand of Nathan my servant, and others of the prophets who had the keys of this power; and in none of these things did he sin against me, save in the case of Uriah and his wife, and therefore he hath fallen from his exaltation and received his portion; and he shall not inherit *them* (his wives) out of the world, *for I gave them unto another*, saith the Lord."

Observe here. GOD *gave the father's wives unto his son* —i.e., David's wives were given to Absalom.

The above statement makes room for another, which we find in the 24th paragraph of this revelation, concerning "the law of the priesthood":—" . . . . And if he have TEN *virgins given unto him by this law*, he CANNOT *commit adultery*, for they *belong to him*, and they are *given* unto him; therefore is he justified."

From this so-called revelation we learn the following particulars:—

1. That Abraham's wives and concubines were given to him by the Lord.
2. That having children by them was accounted to him for *righteousness*.
3. That David, Solomon, and Moses, received their wives from the hand of God.
4. That David did not sin save in the case of Bathsheba.
5. That because David thus sinned, God took his wives from him, and gave them to another.

Now, the above revelation is true or it is false. If true, then the following *four* particulars, taken from the Doc. & Cov. as above quoted, are *absolutely* false. From that quotation we learn—

1. That *Polygamy* is a CRIME.
2. That one man should have but one wife.
3. That a man cannot have a second wife till the first one *dies*.
4. That both the husband and wife are bound to keep themselves *for each other, and from* ALL *others*, during their lives.

I leave the Mormons to reconcile these two revelations *if they can*.

The following revelation from the Book of Mormon will set the question in a still stronger light:—

In the 4th paragraph of the Book of Jacob, we read that during the reign of the second king of the people of Nephi, the people "*began to grow hard in their hearts, and indulge themselves somewhat in* WICKED *practices, such as* LIKE UNTO DAVID *of old, desiring* MANY *wives and concubines, and* ALSO SOLOMON *his* son."

In the 6th paragraph of the second chapter of the same book, we have the following words—"*For behold,* THUS SAITH THE LORD, *this people begin to* WAX IN INIQUITY, *understanding not the Scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves* in COMMITTING WHOREDOMS, *because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon his son.* Behold, DAVID and SOLOMON *truly had many wives and concubines,* WHICH THING WAS ABOMINABLE *before me,* SAITH THE LORD; wherefore, *thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem by the power of mine arm,* that I might raise up unto me a *righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph.* Wherefore, *I the Lord God* WILL NOT SUFFER THAT THIS PEOPLE SHALL DO LIKE THEM of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me and *hearken to the word of the Lord; for there* SHALL NOT ANY MAN among you *have* SAVE IT BE ONE WIFE, *and concubines he* SHALL HAVE NONE; for I THE LORD GOD delighteth in the *chastity* of women, and *whoredoms are an* ABOMINATION *before me, thus saith the Lord of hosts. Wherefore* this people *shall keep my commandments,* SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS, or cursed be the land for their sakes."

In this revelation we have the following particulars :—

1. The people began to wax or increase in iniquity, because they understood not the Scriptures.
2. David and Solomon had many wives.
3. That this practice was *abominable* in the sight of God.
4. That because polygamy had obtained in Jerusalem, the Lord had led the people of Nephi out of that land into America.
5. The reason for this procedure : That "He (God) might raise up unto Himself a *righteous* branch from the loins of Joseph.
6. Because the Lord had this object in view, He would not suffer them to do as David and Solomon did.
7. Therefore, as this conduct was *wicked* and *abominable* in the sight of God, "*one man should have* BUT ONE *wife.*
8. *That this one wife system* PRESERVED *the chastity of women.*
9. That any other practice than the ONE WIFE *system is* WHOREDOM, and brings the curse of God.

My reader will at once see that the above nine particulars *positively contradict* every one of the assertions of Joe Smith in pretended revelation commanding polygamy.

It is a rule in law that, where the majority of witnesses in a cause agree, the verdict shall be ruled thereby. Now, in this case we have TWO witnesses agreeing against one witness—that is, we have two statements condemning and *reprobating* polygamy, and one revelation commanding it. Which are we to believe, the *two* or the *one?* Reason and revelation inform us that by *two* or *three* witnesses

a thing shall be established, we are therefore bound to accept the one wife system—there being two evidences in its favour to one against it.

But, further, we are informed that "the gospel is as clearly stated in the Book of Mormon as it is in the New Testament, and are the same." If this be the case, then another witness is appealed to—what saith it? "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning, made them *male* and *female*. And said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto *his* WIFE, and the TWAIN shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are *no more* TWAIN, but one flesh."

In the above we are taught—

1. That at the creation, God made but *one woman* for *one man*.
2. That a man is to "leave both father and mother, and cleave unto *his wife*"—not *wives*.
3. That by the matrimonial union, *twain* becomes one flesh. Mark,—"TWAIN." Not three, nor four, nor twenty; but "*twain*"—simply, *two*.

Therefore, as according to the Mormons' own admission, we have *three* divine testimonies *against polygamy* for the *pretended one in favour of it*, we are bound to reject it as "*criminal*," "*wicked*," and "*abominable*" in the sight of God.

From this comparison of their own witnesses, we prove Mormonism to be a lying system, and Joseph Smith an arrant impostor.

I am well aware that in the Book of Mormon, a *single* sentence is thrown in between my quotation and the remaining portion of the section, which can be twisted

into an opening for a *future* command to practice polygamy ;* but this is so flatly contradicted by what follows, as well as by what I have quoted, that this attempt to make God contradict himself is the *lamest* I have ever read.

Brevity prevents further observations upon this subject in this place. I would observe, however, that *one third* of the subject is scarcely half exhausted. I might have shewn from the necessary *unchangeableness* of God, that what was a principle of His moral government in the days of David and Solomon, *must be so now.* And therefore, what was "*wicked*" and "*abominable*" in the days of David and Solomon, *must be so* still; unless we admit that the Lord God of Hosts is *changeable* in His attributes, and *therefore* NO God, and thus, at once embrace open ATHEISM, which is the evident tendency of Orson Pratt's argument in his "Great First Cause." A pamphlet, cleverly written, but containing as much downright atheism as was ever published by the Communist, Robert Owen, in his book called the "New Moral World."

When I commenced to write this book, I intended to treat the subject of polygamy in a separate pamphlet, but as many may see this that may not see the next, I thought it better to make this brief reference to the subject in this place. Especially to the Book of Mormon, as Orson Pratt claims more overwhelming testimony to its divine authenticity, correctness, and genuineness, than he allows to Protestant Christians to prove the resurrection of

---

* Sentence referred to—"For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; *otherwise* they shall hearken unto these things."

Christ. See section 7, "Evidences of the Bible and Book of Mormon Compared."

To all who may have any doubts about the fulness of the evidences of Christ's resurrection, I would recommend a careful perusal of Gilbert West's observations thereon.

XI.

First quotation referred to—"Thou shalt ask, and my Scriptures shall be given as I have appointed, and they shall be preserved in safety; and it is expedient that thou shouldst hold thy peace concerning them, and not teach them *until ye have received them in full.* And I give unto you a commandment *that* THEN *ye shall teach them unto* all men; for they shall be taught unto *all nations*, kindreds, tongues, and people."

Second quotation—"And now, behold, I say unto you, it shall not be given unto you to know any further concerning this chapter, *until* the New Testament be translated, and in it all these things shall be made known; wherefore I give unto you power that ye may *now translate* it."

This translation was completed on the second day of July, 1833:—"We have this day *finished* the translation of the Scriptures." "In a letter mailed last week, you will doubtless, before you receive this, have obtained information about the New Translation. Having *finished* the translation of the Bible a few hours since." See letter to the Brethren in Zion, written at Kirtland, and signed Sidney Rigdon, Joseph Smith, junior, F. G. Williams. "Mill. Star," vol. 14, p. 451.

In May, 1833, Joe Smith professed to have received a

revelation, of which the following is an extract:—"And again, verily I say unto you, the second lot on the south shall be dedicated unto me for the *building of an house* unto me for the PRINTING *of the translation* of my Scriptures." Doc. & Cov., page 248.

If, then, *above* 20 *years ago arrangements were being made for the printing* of the (so-called) "New Translation" of the Bible, is it not rather curious that it is not yet printed and circulated throughout the world? Why are they afraid to publish it? Is it because "the world would not receive it?" Or, are they afraid its contents would rouse the indignation of the world? Why do the Mormons so *contumaciously persist* in disobeying the divine (?) command to teach their new translation "to all nations, kindreds, and tongues?" Surely, if Jones's denial be true, I am right in calling Joe Smith *an impostor* —an imitator of Mahommed.

XII.

The command referred to is as follows:—

"And it shall be when He sitteth on the throne of his kingdom, that He shall *write* him a copy of this law in a book which is before the priests the Levites.

"*And thou shalt teach them to thy children*, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

When the children of Israel were located in their different allotments, they could not—in fact, it would be impossible for them to, obey this command, if they had not numerous copies of the law dispersed amongst them.

That copies of both the prophets and the law were in the hands of the Jews during the Babylonish captivity is evident from the words of Daniel—"In the first year of his (Darius') reign, I, Daniel, *understood by books*, the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." In verses 10 to 13, the law of God *as written* by Moses is spoken of as *then* existing.

It matters not if the autograph of Moses was lost or destroyed in the Assyrian invasion when Manasseh was carried captive to Babylon, since we have abundant evidence of the existence of numerous *exact* copies of it; but that the *original was not destroyed* by the Assyrians we have strong presumptive evidence in the finding THE BOOK *of the law* in the Temple during the early part of Josiah's reign. This, I apprehend, was the copy referred to by the prophet Daniel.

XIII.

The following quotation from Horne's introduction, section 3, will set the argument in, if possible, a still stronger light:—

"And first, *with regard to the Old Testament*, although the Jews have been *charged with corrupting it*, yet this charge has *never been substantiated*, and, in fact, *the thing itself is* MORALLY *impossible*.

"There is *no proof or vestige* whatever of such *pretended* alteration. The Jews have, in every age, regarded the Pentateuch as the *genuine* and UNCORRUPTED work of one single person, and have equally respected every part

of it. Indeed, if they had mutilated or corrupted these writings, they would doubtless have expunged every relation of facts and events that militated against the honour and credit of their nation. Besides, when could such an alteration or corruption have been executed? *It was not possible*, shortly after the death of Moses, for the memory of the transactions recorded in the Pentateuch was too recent for any one to venture upon corruption or alteration, which public notoriety would have contradicted. The Pentateuch, therefore, could not have been altered or corrupted so long as Joshua and that generation lived, who were zealous for the worship of the true God. (Josh. xxiv. 31.) From that time to the age of Samuel, the Israelites were under the direction of civil governors or judges, who braved every danger in defence of the form of civil government established in the sacred books.

"Further, if they had *wilfully* corrupted the books of the Old Testament *before the time of Christ and his apostles*, the prophets who flourished from Samuel to Malachi, and who were neither slow nor timid in reproving the sins of both rulers and subjects, would not have passed over so heinous offence in silence. After the separation of the ten tribes, at least, the books of Moses were kept in the kingdom of Israel; and the rivalry that continued to subsist between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah was an insuperable bar to any corruption or alteration, for it could not have been attempted in either kingdom without opposition and detection from the other, of which some notice must have been taken in their historical books. Besides, if the Old Testament *had been corrupted* in the time of Jesus Christ and his apostles, the Jews *could not*

have passed without censure from them, who rebuked their hypocrisy, incredulity, and wickedness, with so much severity. *If there had been any alteration or corruption,* it must have been the work either of *one* or *many* persons. *It cannot be conceived that any one person could do it without being exposed; nor that any one could have vanity enough to expect success in an attempt to alter facts in a book so universally read and so much esteemed.* The unity of design, the correspondence of sentiment, and the uniform reference to the same facts, which are observable throughout the Old Testament, *forbid us to imagine that many* were united in corrupting or altering any part of it. In a word, *no man or number of men, could make an attempt of this kind without being exposed.* Nor is it rational to suppose, that any man or number of men could have capacity competent to effect such a design, who would not also have had the sense to observe the necessity of making it more agreeable to the natural tempers of mankind, in order that it might obtain credit in the world.

"Again, *if the Old Testament had been mutilated or corrupted* AFTER THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, *out of malice to the Christians, and in order to deprive them of arguments and evidences for proving their religion, the Jews would unquestionably have expunged or falsified those memorable prophecies concerning Christ, which were so irrefragably cited both by him and by his apostles. But,* NO SUCH OBLITERATION OR ALTERATION HAS EVER BEEN MADE; *on the contrary, those very passages have continued in their original purity, and are sometimes more express in the original Hebrew* text than *in the common translation.*

"The *agreement of all the manuscripts of the Old Testament* (amounting to nearly eleven hundred and fifty), *which are known to be extant, is a clear proof of its* UNCORRUPTED *preservation.*"—Horne.

"The Old Testament has been translated into a great number of languages; but the only versions, to which we shall now advert, are those which were made either previously to the Christian era, or very shortly after its commencement. At that period, almost all the books of the Old Law had been translated into *Chaldee*, for the use of the Jews in the East, with whom the original Hebrew had ceased to be a living language; the whole had been rendered into Greek (two hundred and eighty-two years before the birth of Jesus Christ,) for the Jews of Alexandria, who were still less acquainted with Hebrew; and at the close of the first, or in the beginning of the second century, the Old Testament was translated into Syriac, for the Syrian Christians. *These three versions have been* PRESERVED to our time—numerous manuscript copies and printed editions of them are extant; and, with the exception of *a few* UNIMPORTANT *differences, they represent to us* the SAME BOOKS, the SAME *predictions,* and the SAME *phrases.* Now, this *agreement* is not the result of any design on the part of the translators, or of any fraud on the part of learned men. These *three sister versions having once issued from their common parent, have been for ever separated by events, and by a rivalship which still subsists.* The Chaldee version, which was *carefully* preserved and consulted by the Hebrews, *remained unknown* to the Christians during the early ages of the Church, and has been in their hands only for two or three centuries. The Christians of Syria knew

as little of the Greek version as the Greeks did of the Syriac; and the Greek version—which was diffused throughout the West, and translated in its turn into Latin, and which, under this second form, became the object of exclusive respect in the Romish Church—could not borrow anything from the other versions, of the existence of which the inhabitants of the West were utterly ignorant. *The agreement, therefore, of these three witnesses,* is so much the more remarkable, as they never could have heard that these versions belonged to rival and hostile Churches, and were the work of inveterate enemies—of Christians and Jews, of Eastern and Western Christians, of Jews of Palestine and Alexandrian Jews. *They do, however,* AGREE *together. Therefore, they give us* WITH CERTAINTY, *the ancient and true text* of the Old Testament, PRECISELY as it was extant before the time of Jesus Christ."—Cellérier, de l'Origin Authentique et Divine de l'Ancien Testament, pp. 148—151, as quoted by Horne.

Equally satisfactory is the evidence for the INTEGRITY and UNCORRUPTNESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT in anything material.

1. The same facts and the same doctrines which we believe on the authority of the New Testament, were believed and received in the first two centuries of the Christian era.

2. Because it would be impossible to corrupt every copy in existence, and not the slightest trace of such corruption can be found in history.

The Christian Church was early rent with fierce contention upon doctrinal points: each party appealed to the Scripture as a warrant for their peculiar ideas. Therefore,

" if one party was inclined either to omit what opposed their peculiar tenets, or to insert what might afford them additional support, there was always some other party both ready and willing to detect the fraud. And even if they persevered in altering their *own* manuscripts, they had not the power of altering the manuscripts in the hands of their opponents. Though the corruption, therefore, might be partial, it could not become general. Nor must we forget that the books which compose the Greek Testament, have been transcribed, beyond all comparison, more frequently than the works of any other Greek author. And it is evident, that the difficulty of corrupting the Greek manuscripts must have increased with every increase in their number. Though it cannot be denied, therefore, that there is stronger temptation to alter a work which relates to doctrines than to alter a work which relates to matters indifferent, the impediments to the alteration of the Greek manuscripts were still more powerful than the temptation. The Gospels, which were written in different places, and the Epistles, which were addressed to different communities, were multiplied in copies, dispersed in Palestine and Egypt, in Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. *Under such circumstances, a general corruption of the Greek manuscripts was a thing impossible;* for it could not have been effected without a union of sentiment, which never existed—nor without a general combination, which could not have been formed before Christianity had received a civil establishment; but if such a combination had been practicable, it could not have been carried into effect without becoming a matter of general notoriety, and ecclesiastical historians are *silent* on such a combination. The *silence* of history is

indeed no argument against the truth of a fact established by induction, if the fact was such that it could not be generally known. But the silence of history is important in reference to a fact which, if it ever existed, *must* have been a subject of general notoriety. *Whatever corruptions, therefore, may have taken place in the Greek manuscripts, those corruptions must have been confined to a few, and could not by any possibility, have been extended to them all.*"—Bishop Marsh's Lectures, part 6, pp. 10, 11.

Scores of similar quotations on the same subject might be given, but the above, I think, will convince any candid mind, that Orson Pratt's assertion that "*the Bible manuscripts were awfully corrupt in almost every text,*" is *proved* to be false, unfounded, and irrational.

Those who wish to see the subject of the *genuineness, authenticity*, and UNCORRUPTEDNESS of the manuscripts from which our Bible was translated, treated in full, would do well to consult—

Bishop Tomline's Introduction to the Study of the Bible

Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study of the Bible

Dr. Lardner's Works, &c., &c.

[N.B.—I wish to inform the reader that the reference accidentally omitted after the last clause of Note IX., p. 61, about free people of colour, will be found in the "Mill. Star," vol. 14, p. 471. There also, we learn that such were not allowed even to live in the Mormon State. This was in A.D. 1833, just two years after the pretended revelation to "call bond and free" was given.]

APPENDIX.

Now, my dear readers, having gone through the foregoing pages, and having unexpectedly, room for a few more observations, allow me to fix your attention, by a few brief remarks, upon a very important subject. I know that the various contradictory systems and pretended revelations have induced many to view religion as a humbug or a bugbear, to scare the "vile herd" of mankind and keep them in order. But such do not exercise right reason in this most important of all subjects; for, as "Truth lies somewhere," instead of being turned away from its contemplation by incongruous systems, we should the rather be led to more minutely investigate the matter. The study of the Bible, with prayerful attention, will dissipate all our fears. It contains indubitable evidence of its divine origin. It appeals to our hopes and fears for the future—it warns us of coming danger, to lead us to repentance, and thereby enjoy coming glory. And, in order that we may not labour under any mistake about the matter, its language is at once simple and sublime—so simple, that a "wayfaring man, though a fool" in the concerns of time, "shall not err therein;" and yet so sublime, that the mightiest intellect cannot exhaust its stores.

As a specimen, we shall briefly consider the following passage from 1 Peter ii. 2:—

"As new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby."

A "new born babe." Why, this is an every day occurrence—what can there be so extraordinary in a new born babe that it should be so prominently set before us as a test for self-examination?

"New born" implies a previous state of darkness and non-relationship to the surrounding world. In the world they are, it is true, surrounded by the light of the sun, yet heeding it not nor enjoying the pleasure of its beams. Thus it is a fit emblem of every child of man. Mere moral or social excellence alters not our position—for "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not." Here then, the analogy between the babe before its birth and every son of Adam is complete. The one surrounded by the light of the orb of day, yet in darkness, the other surrounded by the light of the sun of righteousness as it beams forth from the Word of God, yet still in darkness, heeding not the dread thunders of His wrath, nor the still small voice of everlasting love.

Reader! art thou one of those? O, be wise in time—delay is dangerous; "for there is neither knowledge nor device in the grave whither thou art hastening." It is an awful truth—"As the tree falleth, so it lies." If death overtakes us in an impenitent state, the dire denunciation is—"He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is unholy, let him be unholy still."

"New born babes desire." Have you never noticed

this? When the babe is healthy, how soon it cries out for food. And why, because it feels its need—it breathes a different atmosphere, and therefore requires different food. Thus it is with the Christian—formerly he was satisfied with the food of this world, its pleasures enticed him; in the midst of its vanities he sought happiness, as the babe drew its sustenance from its mother's womb and yet was dead to all the surrounding activities of conscious existence. So was he "dead whilst he lived," drawing his sustenance from nature's darkness without relationship to God as his Father—"secure, insensible."

But, what a change. He is born again. Born, not of the womb of nature, but of grace—free grace. "Born, not of corruptible things such as silver and gold, but by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever." He now desires, and like the babe, expresses that desire in earnest prayer to the "Father of lights" for the healing beams of the "Sun of Righteousness" to warm and invigorate his soul. And, like the babe that, feeling its utter helplessness, clings to its nurse, and cries and struggles—regardless of her convenience—till its wants are satisfied, he exclaims—"I will not let Thee go, except thou bless me." Such are described by our Lord as "they who hunger and thirst after righteousness."

The "new born babe desires" neither the intoxicating draught nor the strong meat of the full grown man, but its mother's breast—that food which is calculated to strengthen and perfect its embryo frame; so the new born Christian desires not the exciting draught of theological disquisitions, nor the strong meat of sectarian technicalities, but the "sincere milk of the Word." Mark

the word "sincere." There is a "pure word" as well as an impure. "Beware," saith our Lord, "of the leaven (or doctrine) of the Pharisees;" there is, therefore, a word which "ministers grace to the hearers" as well as one which "corrupts." The desire, then, of the soul that has been awakened to a sense of its lost condition by the thunder of Sinai which rings in his ears—"Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them;" or, drawn by the endearing strains of compassion sounding in his ear—"Why will ye die." The desires of such, I say, are earnest—an intensity of feeling is manifest. Whilst, with an intolerable burden of sin upon his back, he endeavours to flee from the "city of destruction," and set his face toward the heavenly country. Once, in the hardness of his heart, he thought he was rich—rich in moral excellence—alive without the knowledge of the requirements of God's law; but now, the law has come into his soul, and he dies—dies to the pride of fame, to the pomp of wealth, to all "the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," the "fashion whereof passeth away."

And why is he thus dead? because—he lives. He has received the truth, the Word of God—in the belief of it. He is born again, and is therefore conscious of his abject poverty in spiritual matters. He beholds himself absolutely naked of all that can be of service to him in "that day, when the LORD shall judge the world in righteousness." Once he breathed the fœtid air of hell, now he breathes the salubrious atmosphere of the Celestial country, which whets his appetite—strengthens his spirit's digestive organs, and in the eagerness of his soul, he

exclaims—"Who will shew me any good?" The word of Truth has thus been a "lamp to his feet" in exhibiting his danger, and now becomes "a light to his path" to lead him onward in the "new and living way." Oh, how he delights to meditate upon that Word by day and night. It directs his attention to the blood-stained tree; there he beholds "a spectacle of woe"—his astonished soul contemplates the sad scene; but, hark! a voice is heard—"Look unto me and be thou saved." This is what he wants—nothing less than salvation—complete salvation—will satisfy his soul. The crown of thorns—the dying agony—the bleeding side—the pierced hands and feet—present unmistakable evidence that "He loved me and gave himself for me." "This truth—this blessed truth—sets him free" from the weight of sin. He leaves his burden at the Cross—joy fills his breast, and his enraptured soul exclaims—"Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift." Unspeakable indeed, is the believer's joy—it must be felt to be known. The change from a dunghill to a throne is not to be compared to those feelings which possess the soul of him who, having trembled on the brink of hell, feels that he now possesses the title deeds "to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." He enjoys the earnest of that inheritance by "the spirit of adoption," whereby he is enabled to "cry—Abba, Father;" therefore, he is filled with "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

Reader! is it thus with thee. If not—be no longer a soul murderer. Flee for thy life to the "city of refuge" (Jesus) for justice, "the avenger of blood is at hand."

The object to be accomplished by satisfying the desires

of the "new born babe"—is growth. Growth implies progression, or advancement from one state or condition to another; thus the babe, by proper nourishment, advances from infancy to youth—from youth to manhood. So also the babe in Christ "desires the sincere milk of the Word," that he may not only "grow in knowledge," but also "in grace" or favour with God. His desire is to behold "the wondrous things which the law of God contains," that he may "cleanse his way by taking heed thereto." As he advances in the "knowledge of his Lord and Saviour" his desires increase, and his hungry soul cries out—"Satisfy me early with thy mercy," for "Thy loving kindness is better than life." His soul thus "follows hard after God."

Another feature. See the babe, when danger threatens, nestling upon its mother's bosom in conscious security. And why, because it has read the language of her heart in her looks; how often has its little soul rejoiced in that expression of a mother's love—her looks, more expressive than her words, has enchanted its little heart. Then, why not fly to the source of its joy as a harbour of safety when danger is nigh; in so doing, it expresses full confidence in her love.

So also the believing soul, having felt the loving kindness of his God—having with "joy drank water from the wells of salvation," he runs to "the dear bosom of his God," and is safe in the pavilion that surrounds the Throne of grace—is safe from the fiery darts of the wicked one. The lion may roar—the tiger may growl and grin; but within the precincts of Jehovah's arms, they dare not come. Thus he proves the truth of that

Scripture—"The Lord is a strong tower: the righteous run into it, and are safe." Safe "amid death's alarms"—he can "smile to see a burning world."

This fleeing to Jesus to "hide him till the storm be overpast" is an expression of deep and holy confidence in His power and willingness, to "save even unto the uttermost all that come unto God by Him." He desires no other instructor—for Jesus only "hath the words of eternal life." The Holy Spirit, as the nurse, has prepared his food; and while he sucks at the breasts of the Gospel, he knows—he experiences the glad truth, that Jesus is unto him "wisdom," to guide him in every season of difficulty or danger; his "righteousness" to cover him, "that the shame of his nakedness may not appear."

> "Clothed in this robe how bright he shines,
> Angels might envy such a dress—
> Angels have not a robe like his,
> The robe of Jesus's righteousness."

He feels that Jesus is to him "sanctification" to cleanse him from all iniquity, and make him "pure in heart." The experience of these unspeakable blessings assure him that Jesus will be his complete "redemption"—even "from the power of the grave;" and that there is laid up for him "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

READER, IS IT THUS WITH THEE?

References to the portions of Scripture quoted in the above:—Rom. iii. 23; John i. 5; Eccles. ix. 10: Rev. xxii. 11; Jer. iv. 3; Matt. xiii. 22; 2 Peter i. 8; Luke viii. 18; Gal. iii. 10; Ezek. xviii. 31; Rom. vii. 9—12; 1 Cor. vii. 31; Zach. iii. 3, 4; Ps. ix. 8; Acts xvii. 31; Ps. iv. 6, and cxix. 105; Heb. x. 20; Isa. xlv. 22; Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Peter i. 4, 8; Gal. iv. 6; Numb. xxxv. 12; 2 Peter iii. 18; Ps. cxix. 9, 18, and xc. 14, and lxiii. 3, 8; Isa. xii. 6; Ps. lxi. 3, 4; Prov. xviii. 10; Isa. xxvi. 20; Heb. vii. 25; John vi. 68; Rev. iii. 18; Hosea xiii. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 1.

As all the Subscription Lists have not yet been forwarded to me, I cannot insert the names of the Country Subscribers; should a Second Edition be called for, this defect can be remedied. The following have come to hand :—

T. Barker, Lord Bishop of Sydney
Sir Alfred Stephen, Chief Justice
Honble. Robert Campbell, M.L.A.
Honble. A. P. Lutwyche, M.L.C.
John Fairfax, Esq.
Rev. Alexander Salmon, (Free Church,) Sydney
Rev. — Wilkinson, Enfield
Rev. Joseph Beazley (Congregational)
Mr. Pearse
Mr. James Pemel
Mr. W. Terry
Mr. John Crofton Mollay
Mr. S. Potter
Mr. John Walker
Mr. R. P. Armstrong
Messrs. Jones & James
Mr. Howit
Friends at Dungog, 20 copies
Mr. D. Cunningham
Messrs. Learmonth & Buyers
Mr. Skinner
Mr. James Robey
Mr. Callaghan
Mr. Lusty
Mr. Parker
Alderman Neale
Mr. John Neale
Friends at Clarence River, 12 copies
Mr. W. Henson
Mr. John File.

Printed at the Empire General Steam Printing Office, Hunter street, Sydney.